

➤HEBRAICA.◀

VOL. V.

JANUARY, 1889.

NO. 2.

NOTES ON THE PSALMS.¹

BY SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D. D., LL. D.,

London, England.

LXXVIII. Of late date, in the time of the Babylonish captivity. V. 63.

Notwithstanding the Septuagint and the Vulgate with which Gesenius agrees, I take הַלֵּל as the Pual "praised in (nuptial) song." In the 66th verse אָחֹר means "backward;" not "in the hinder parts" with reference to 1 Sam. v. 6. Such reference is wrong, for the verse relates to the victories of Saul and Samuel over the Philistines. In the 65th verse "like a hero *overpowered* with wine," a version rightly adopted by Gesenius, Ewald, Hupfeld, and others. "*Refreshed* with wine" is incorrect. Dr. Kay, who made a version of the Psalms, for which work he was hardly competent, wrongly translates "*joyous* with wine."

LXXX. Of late date, perhaps a prayer of the people in their captivity at Babylon.

The 17th verse would have a better position after the 14th. What is the subject of the verb "let them perish"? According to the context, *the Israelites*. But this intercalation is unnatural. The beginning of the 19th verse should belong to the 18th, "thou madest strong for thyself and he will not go back from thee." The verb נָסוֹן is the Perfect of Niphal, 3d person. The "Son of Man," equivalent to the Israelites.

LXXXI. This Psalm begins with an allusion to the Feast of Tabernacles, celebrated in the middle of the 7th month, that is, at the full moon of it, and called "our feast;" the Passover and unleavened bread are not referred to. In the 6th verse "when he (God) went out against the land of Egypt," as an enemy for the deliverance of his people, the language is general. "I hear a

language which I did not know" alludes to what follows, to the mysterious, divine voice which the fact imagines, and therefore clothes his ideas in the language it speaks to him. And the words thus suggested are continued to the end of the chapter.

LXXXII. This Psalm refers to oppressive, unjust kings who treated the Israelites harshly when they had power over them. That אֱלֹהִים means *kings* in verse 1 is shown by the 6th verse, where it has the same sense. Hupfeld argues that it has the sense of *angels* in this place, so that God is represented as presiding over a court of angels whom he judges, reproves, and addresses in the singular language of the 7th verse. But we agree with Gesenius that the plural Elohim never means *angels*; and cannot but think that Hupfeld's reasoning in favor of that sense is weak. Yet he is followed in the present case by DeWette and Kamphausen. The old error that Elohim means *judges* here and in Exod. xxi. 6; xxii. 8; xxiii. 28 is repeated by Lowe and Jennings. In the Pentateuch it is applied to God alone; here to kings, not to theocratic but foreign ones.

LXXXIV. The last words of the 4th verse, viz., "thine altars, O Lord of hosts, my King and my God," cannot be in apposition to the house and nests of the birds mentioned. I prefer their transference to the middle clause of the 5th verse. "Blessed are they who dwell in thy house, thine altars, O Lord of hosts, my King and my God, they will be still praising thee." Hupfeld, however, prefers to supply "but I" before *altars*, which brings out a good sense. DeWette translates אֵת "at thine altars," but this does not do away the difficulty, since birds *could not* lay their nests *at* the altars. See "Fresh Revision," p. 66.

LXXXVII. To the first verse belong the words which are now in the second, "Jehovah loves." "The gates of Zion" is parallel to "his foundation on the holy mountains," both meaning Jerusalem. In the 3d verse נִכְבְּדוֹת is used adverbially, "gloriously it is said of thee" (by God). In the 4th verse Jehovah himself is introduced as the speaker. The last verse as it stands says, "Singers as dancers (say) all my springs (of salvation) are in thee." There is something forced in this; and the word rendered *springs* should probably be pointed differently so as to bring out the sense, "they sing and dance, all *who dwell* in thee." So Hupfeld takes the meaning. The Psalm can hardly belong to the time of Hezekiah just after the overthrow of Sennacherib before Jerusalem, because hostile and bitter feelings of the Jews against Babylon were then entertained; rather does it indicate a time when such feelings were changed, and hopes were cherished of Babylon and the other nations mentioned being reckoned among the regenerate of Zion. The fact that Assyria is omitted among the peoples is an indication that the new Zion is referred to, so that the Psalm should be dated some time after

the return of the exiles from Babylon; not when the Assyrians were still feared and hated.

LXXXVIII. This Psalm describes the state of a cheerless sufferer who is brought very near the gates of death. It is not Messianic; a suffering Messiah being unknown to the Old Testament. Nor is there the least probability in the peculiar hypothesis of Delitzsch that Heman the Ezrahite, suffering from the disease of leprosy, was the author not only of the Psalm but of the Book of Job. There are indeed coincidences of language between the Psalm and the Book of Job, which in our opinion show that the Psalm should be dated in the captivity; the author having been acquainted with the dramatic composition of his unknown predecessor. The figurative language does not justify the assumption that the writer was suffering from a disease. The 6th verse begins, "Prostrate among the dead," etc. "My couch is," etc., as Ewald and Hitzig render, is less probable. V. 8, render, "thou hast brought down (upon me) all thy waves." Gesenius's "thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves" involves an unusual construction of the verb. Hupfeld's rendering is also unsatisfactory. V. 16, not "I have borne thy terrors *even unto distraction*," but "I must sink," "I will sink," the verb having *he* voluntative at the end.

LXXXIX. A Psalm apparently written immediately before the captivity by one who speaks in the name of the whole people or of their theocratic king. V. 51. The last member is difficult and the reading should be changed, "that I bear in my bosom all (the reproach) of many peoples." כָּל before the last two plurals is unusual, but if חֲרִפָּת be inserted after it, the construction is tolerable, "all the reproach of many peoples" who are identical with "thy servants" in the first member. The Psalmist speaks as a representative sufferer. He suffers for the nation. See "Fresh Revision," p. 64.

XC. This Psalm was not written by Moses, but is of much later date. It refers to a time of national depression and calamity; either to that of the exile, or to some other period of adversity. V. 4. "When it passes; and a watch in the night." The authorized version is incorrect here. V. 5. With Hupfeld I put בִּבְקָר in the first member of the verse; "they become asleep in the morning, as the grass passes away." V. 9. "We consume our years like a whisper (or breath)." Gesenius's meaning of the word *whisper* is "thought." Others translate "a sigh," "a breath." The idea of a *low murmur* lies in the verb הָנָה the root of the noun; and there is no good reason for making הָנָה into two verbs, as Gesenius does. V. 11. Render the second member, "and thy wrath, according to the fear of thee," i. e. in proportion to the due fear of thee.

XCI. Though the beginning of this Psalm is awkward, I cannot adopt the supplement of אֲשֵׁר, "blessed is he that sits in the secret place of the Most

High, who lodges in the shadow of the Almighty; he says to Jehovah," etc., which also requires the alteration of the vowel points of אָמַר, making them express the participle אֹמֵר, instead אָמַר the first person sing. of the Imperfect. Though this construction is favored by Symmachus, Lowth, Hupfeld, Olshausen, and Kamphausen, it introduces too violent an innovation. Notwithstanding the awkwardness attaching to the common translation and punctuation, it is better to adhere to it than to assume the omission of אֲשֶׁר.

XCIV. V. 17. כִּמְעַט means here *soon* or *shortly*. Ewald renders it badly, "vielleicht schon," *perhaps already*; and Hupfeld not much better, "um ein kleines." The beginning of the 18th verse is also incorrectly translated by Ewald, "as soon as I think." It is right in the authorized version. V. 21 should be, "they crowd against the soul of the righteous," etc. The translation "sie schaaren sich" does not give the force of the verb, which implies *hostile pressure* upon. Yet it is adopted by Ewald and Hupfeld. DeWette's "rotten sich" is better.

XCV. V. 4, "the heights of the mountains," according to the etymology, "the toilsome heights of the mountains;" as the word occurs in Job xxii. 25 in the sense of *toils*. The root is יָעַר which Ewald arbitrarily takes to be an equivalent to יָפַע to shine, and brings out the sense "sunny heights of the mountains!" In verse 7 the words should be transposed so as to read, "we are the people of his hand and the sheep of his pasture." In the 7th verse, "to-day if you hear his voice, harden not," etc., should begin the 8th verse, and then אִם has its proper conditional sense; not the optative one, as it is here understood by Gesenius, "would that you heard his voice to-day."

XCVI. This Psalm is of late date, and suggests the time of the later Isaiah because of the hopes expressed respecting the subjection and conversion of the heathen. It is used by the Chronicle writer, who adapts it to David, making it a part of the Psalm he used when the ark was set up on Mount of Zion. DeWette's exposition of the Psalm is excellent.

XCIX. This is a temple Psalm and probably of late date. Notwithstanding Hupfeld's objections, I take the beginning of the 4th verse to be dependent on the verb *praise* in the 3d, and translate, "the majesty of the King who loves right." The last two words of the 3d verse are parenthetical, "He is holy."

CI. This Psalm is David's composition, when he had just been established in Jerusalem as king. The second verse does not allude to the bringing of the ark into the city, but is an expression of inward longing for the presence of Jehovah. It is better to abide by the usual rendering, "when wilt thou come unto me?" than to get rid of the ejaculation; and the note of interrogation, מִתִּי, cannot be taken as a conjunction, for it is not so used in Hebrew. Hupfeld's adducement of Arabic and Syriac interrogatives is too remote.

CIV. The first member of v. 1 and the same words at the end of the Psalm, along with "Hallelujah," are liturgical additions by a later hand. V. 4. The translation, "who makes winds his messengers; flaming fire his ministers," is the only correct one. That of the received version and the Septuagint, the latter followed by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, is wrong. The making of His angels into winds and fires would give an unsuitable sense to the Psalm—one that is also unnecessary to the argument of the Epistle. As to the inversion of the two nouns after the verb, which some think a great objection to the only rendering that makes tolerable sense, no grammatical rule should be taken to override good sense. Besides, rules may be violated and sometimes are so by writers superior to the present one. See "Fresh Revision," pp. 77, 78. V. 24, "thy creatures," not "thy possessions" or "thy riches."

CV. v. 18. "Into the iron came his soul." It flattens the words to translate "he was laid in chains of iron." The Chaldee followed by the Vulgate gives the popular version, "the iron entered into his soul"; and this might be defended, adopted as it is by Hitzig and Delitzsch; but it violates strict grammar. V. 37, "and there was none among their tribes that tottered," i. e. through weariness.

CVI. The last verse (48) was added by the compilers.

CVII. v. 3. מִיָּמִין should be מִיָּמִין "from the south." 4th verse, there is no need for supplying לֹא before דֶּרֶךְ "in a waste of a way," i. e. a waste way. From v. 17 to 22 reference is to the saving of the sick, so that the paragraph beginning with v. 17 has its predicate at v. 21. One is tempted to alter אֱוִילִים *foolish*, and different readings have been proposed, but without authority. The word here is appropriate. V. 39. A new subject is not here introduced—"And they were minished and sank," etc. The 40th verse comes in abruptly, being a quotation from Job xii. 21, 24. We may supply "This is His doing who" pours, etc.

CVIII. This Psalm is made up of two pieces taken from others, viz., LVII. 8-12 and LX. 7-14; and the variations of the text from those of the originals are usually for the worse. If neither of the originals be Davidic Psalms, it follows that CVIII. is not; though the inscription appears to say so. The latter is very late, perhaps of the Maccabean times. V. 11, the strong city cannot be identified. The second part of the verse means, "who led me to Edom?" V. 12, "Hast not thou, O God, cast us off, and goest not forth, O God, with our armies." The English translation is wrong.

CIX. This Psalm contains stronger imprecations against an enemy than any other. It is not Messianic; neither can the use of it by Peter, as recorded in the Acts, make it apply to Judas. And it does not suit the character of David as though he were the author speaking prophetically. In any case it is directly

contrary to the spirit of Christianity, which inculcates the love of enemies, not the cursing of them. It is an evasion of the difficulty to assume that these curses are put into the mouth of David's enemies, not of himself. The composition probably belongs to a time subsequent to David's.

- CX. It is usual to take this Psalm as Messianic and to interpret it of Messiah's warfare and exaltation. The New Testament is cited as a proof of this; our Lord himself saying that David wrote it with regard to a greater than himself, that is, the expected Messiah. Again it is alleged that Peter in the Acts (II. 36) takes the Messianic import for granted. But Christ did not meddle with critical questions connected with the Old Testament, as his mission was of another character; he simply acquiesced in the current views of such questions as long as they did not affect the nature of that mission. Besides he applied more than once the *argumentum ad hominem* to his opponents, which he seems to have done in this instance. In regard to the apostles, we cannot in all cases adopt their interpretations of the Old Testament, since they were not infallible. The Psalm probably refers to the Maccabean times, and to one of the Hasmonæan princes, such as Jonathan. The 3d verse may be rendered, "Thy people are free-will offerings in the day of thy might, in holy dress; from the womb of the morning shall be to thee the dew of thy youth;" i. e. the young men of thy people should be numerous and fresh as the drops of morning dew. I do not think the reading **הָרִי** "mountains" for **הָרֵי** "vestments" should be adopted; though Hupfeld, DeWette and others assign reasons for preferring it. The unusual word would be changed for a common one, not the reverse. "Holy mountains" would refer to Zion, from which the conquering army sets forth. In the 6th verse, "he has filled [the land] with dead bodies," we supply a word from the following context. This hemistic and the next, "he has shattered heads over a wide country," disprove the Messianic sense, for it is far-fetched to apply them to the spiritual triumph of Messiah over the power of sin, as Jennings and Lowe do.

- CXII. 4. "There has risen in the darkness a light for the upright; [to him who] is gracious, merciful and upright." The second member of the verse is difficult. The three adjectives stand absolutely without connection with the preceding words. They might refer to Jehovah, though the last adjective does not agree with that. Probably they allude to the **יְשָׁרִים** which they individualize. There is no good reason for changing **תֵּאֵר** (v. 10) into **תִּקְרָה**, with Hupfeld.

- CXIII. 10. The article in **הַבְּנִים** (the sons) is irregular and incorrect. This Psalm with the next five made up what was called the great Hallel, which was sung on feast days, especially at the Passover; CXIII., CXIV. before the paschal meal, CXV.-CXVIII. after it.

CXV. This is a late liturgical Psalm, and was probably intended for different voices, with different music. But it is not easy to make the division. There are changes at 9-11, 12-15, 16-18. The solos of Ewald are doubtful. Hupfeld goes to an extreme in denying such change of voices.

CXVI. A post-exile Psalm, the language of one delivered from sore affliction. Vs. 10 and 11 are difficult, and have received accordingly different interpretations. I translate them thus: "I trusted [even] when I said, 'I am greatly afflicted' (referring to the language of the 4th verse); I said in my alarm, 'all men are liars.'" The authorized version is undoubtedly wrong, though it follows Luther. I cannot account for the perverted sense given to this passage by Delitzsch and Kamphausen.

CXVII. Though the first verse of this temple Psalm is referred to the Gentiles in Romans xv. 11, there is no reason for supposing that the Jewish writer had regard to such extension of free grace. Jewish particularism is not over-leaped by the use of "all ye peoples," which is merely a poetical figure.

CXVIII. 27. This Psalm probably originated in the Maccabean times. Some at least of its contents agree well with the history of the heroes who fought against their enemies so courageously. Perhaps the reference is to the circumstances connected with the solemn inauguration of Simon as high priest as well as captain and governor of the Jews (comp. 1 Maccab. xiv.). The Psalm was applied to the Messiah at the time of Christ, as the citation of the 22d verse in the Gospels and Acts shows; but it is not necessary to suppose on that account that such was the original sense. "Unto the horns of the altar." Delitzsch's view is here improbable, viz., that the number of victims is considered so great that the binding of them had to go on even up to the projecting horns of the altar. It is better to take the words thus: "Bind the sacrificial victim with cords, [and bring it] up to the horns of the altar."

CXIX. This Psalm is of late date, having been composed after the return from the Babylonian captivity. It is impossible to discover the character of the writer, what was his age, or what his position. Internal evidence does not show whether he was old or young, in prison or free. He was a pious sufferer who pours forth his requests and complaints before Jehovah. The Psalm is artificial and monotonous, showing very little poetic power or originality. Its sentences are unconnected and there is no progression. The writer repeats the different expressions in which he describes the law, and grows tedious in his mechanical ogdoads. The effusions of his soul lack warmth, so that we might be disposed to attribute them to an aged teacher.

V. 83. The comparison to a bottle of smoke refers to the dried up and shriveled state in which the writer finds himself. Hupfeld, after Rosenmüller, refers the simile to the ripening character of the affliction; bottles filled with wine and hung in the smoke ripening and mellowing the liquor; but surely this is an artificial conception.

V. 91, the authorized version appears to be correct here. The heaven and the earth are nominatives to the verb *stand* or *continue*. Were it not for הַיּוֹם *to-day*, or *till to-day* we should incline to take לְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ with Hitzig as a nominative; but, as the words stand, the common version is preferable. V. 147, "I am early up in the dawn, and cry." The authorized version of this member is incorrect.

V. 126 "It is time to act for Jehovah; they have broken thy law." Lowe and Jennings give incorrectly "It is time for Jehovah to work." Ewald renders erroneously and loosely, "Raise thyself, O Jehovah; it is time."

CXX.-CXXXIV. These fifteen Psalms are entitled "songs of degrees;" a very indefinite and obscure expression, the different interpretations of which may be seen in Hupfeld's commentary. The most probable sense is "pilgrim songs," i. e., odes sung by the pilgrims as they traveled to Jerusalem to keep the feasts. All are similar in language and tone, and may have been written by the same person. They belong to the post-exilic period; probably to Ezra's time or a little later.

CXX. It is probable that the punctuators took רַמְיָה (v. 2) for an adjective, *deceitful*, and hence the pointing of the preceding word. We prefer to depart from their authority and to put the word *tongue* in the construct state; *tongue of deceit*. The third verse is different. I translate it, "What will He (God) give thee; and what will He add to thee, thou deceitful tongue?" The punishment is given in the next verse; "sharp arrows," etc.

CXXI. v. 1. "Whence shall my help come?" interrogatively. V. 3, "let him not suffer thy foot to be moved." אֵל should not be taken as לֵא, with the authorized version. To make a new question, "surely He will not," etc., with Ewald, creates linguistic difficulty.

CXXII. This is not a Psalm of David. It was written by a returned exile from Babylon after Jerusalem had been rebuilt. The chief difficulty in understanding the meaning arises from Perfect tenses of the verb in the first five verses. The poet throws himself back into bygone times when the tribes went up to Jerusalem on three annual occasions. The Perfects in vs. 2, 4, 5 should be rendered as past, *stood*, *went up*, *were set*; v. 4 should be translated "a law to Israel;" v. 6, "wish for prosperity to Jerusalem."

CXXIV. v. 3. אֵין. Hupfeld denies that this is an Aramæan form of אֵין; which is a hasty statement.

CXXVII. The title is spurious; nay, it is likely that the writer had in his mind the life and writings of Solomon. In v. 2 בִּן signifies *so much, the same*, "in sleep," not "by sleep."

CXXVIII. v. 2. Hupfeld transposes the two members of the verse, translating "happy art thou and it is well with thee," for thou shall eat, etc. It is too bold to make this change without the least authority. בִּי is translated *yea*

by Ewald, De Wette and others, "yea thou wilt eat it," but the particle never had this sense. The Septuagint passes over the word.

CXXXIX. v. 2. **Qj**. This particle is a connecting one. Whether it is ever adversative, signifying *but, yet, nevertheless*, is rightly denied by Hupfeld, in opposition to Gesenius, Ewald, and others. The passages quoted by Ewald, in favor of the acceptance usually adopted in the present and other places are not convincing (Lehrbuch, p. 856). Render "they have not also overpowered me."

V. 6, render "which is withered before it is picked up," not "before it grows up."

CXXX. This Psalm is post-exilic, but the occasion in which it originated is obscure. It is doubtful whether it refers to the time of the temple restoration under Zerubbabel. The Psalm contains a prayer for the preservation of the sanctuary and the throne of David on Zion. The writer refers back to the time when David set up the ark on Mount Zion, with which he couples the divine promises respecting the perpetuity of David's royal line. The Chronicler has incorporated vs. 8-10 in the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple. See 2 Chron. vi. 41,41.

CXXXIV. The third verse seems to be a response to the greeting of the person who speaks in the first and second verses.

CXXXV. This Psalm is for the most part a compilation from others; in addition to v. 7 from Jer. x. 13, and v. 14 from Deut. xxxii. 36.

CXXXVII. Soon after the return from captivity an Israelite gives expression to his bitter feelings against the oppressors, and expresses a strong desire for revenge. The patriotism of the Jews was impregnated with passion and hatred of their enemies. V. 5, "let my right hand forget *its power*." V. 8, "thou wasted me," "who art to be destroyed," is contrary to the form of the word. The passive participle of Qal does not admit such a signification.

CXXXVIII. This Psalm may have been sung by Zerubbabel, as Ewald supposes. It is certainly of post-exilic date. V. 1, "before the gods" means the heathen deities. V. 2b, this is a very difficult clause, meaning, perhaps, "thou hast magnified thy word (that is, the promise in 2 Sam. vii., by fulfilling it now) above all thy name;" above every other manifestation of thy name. The language is that of hyperbole; 4b should be translated "for they have heard."

CXXXIX. This is not a Psalm of David as the title says, but one of post-exile origin, as its Aramæisms show. The divine presence and omniscience of God are finely described; but the language and construction present much difficulty. V. 9. The *and* supplied in the authorized version is wrong. There is no need for any supplement; and if there were, it should be *or*, "should I settle down at the end of the west."

V. 11, 12, "And should I say; let darkness alone cover me, and the light about me; even darkness would not be too dark for thee, and night would lighten as the day; as in the darkness so in the light." V. 14, "I will praise in that I am wonderfully distinguished." V. 16, "Thine eyes saw my substance, and in thy book were they all written; days were predestined, when there was not yet one among them." The word translated *substance*, means an unformed mass, the embryo foetus, the members of which are undeveloped; and the *days* are those of human life. Hupfeld's explanation of the verse is unsatisfactory. V. 17, "how difficult are thy thoughts, etc." V. 18, "I wake up and am still with thee," i. e. I wake up from my dreamy meditation, and am still lost in the contemplation of thee. V. 20, "they who rebel against thee wickedly; they lift themselves up in vain against thee." The words מִרְוֶה and עֲרִיךְ should be changed into מִרְוֶה and עֲלִיךְ. The first can hardly be the future Qal of אָמַר. V. 24, "And see if there be a way of idolatry in me, and lead me in the ways everlasting;" that is, which leads to everlasting life.

CXL.-CXLII. These three Psalms were composed after the Assyrian invasion, perhaps in the time of Manasseh, as Ewald supposes, and probably by the same author. No marked linguistic features assign them to a Davidic authorship. Psalm CXL. vs. 9, 10. The last word of verse cannot be translated, "lest they exalt themselves," or as Ewald has it, "lest they get the victory." The supplement of the word *lest* is too forced and far-fetched, but the Septuagint favors it. The verb should be joined to the beginning of the next verse and then we have the sense, "should those who compass me about lift up the head, let the iniquity of their lips cover them." Ewald's acceptance of ראשׁ in the sense of *poison* must be rejected, though apparently favored by *lips* in the second member of the verse. Kamphausen's comment on the passage is hesitating and unsatisfactory.

CXLI. That this Psalm is David's and was probably written at the beginning of Absalom's rebellion cannot be accepted. The attempts which have been made to explain several of its verses by circumstances in the life of David are nugatory. V. 5. Literally the last clause says, "for yet, and my prayer is against their wickednesses." The words seem corrupt, but how to restore their original form is an impossible thing. V. 6. "Their judges were cast down into the hands (power) of the rock; and they heard my words that they are pleasant." The interpretation of this language cannot but be always perplexing. Perhaps the allusion in the first member is to the overthrow of the leading judges of the people, righteous rulers hurled down the rock. In this case the hearers of the speaker's or writer's words are different persons. Ewald's translation cannot be accepted: "Their judges are thrown into the hands of the rock; and should one hear that my words are pleasant?" His

interpretation is utterly improbable. DeWette renders, "Their judges are hurled down from the rock; then are heard my words which are so pleasant;" i. e., when the judges of the heathen are overthrown, then shall those (the righteous) who share my lot, hear my words of triumph over their destruction. Jennings and Lowe give a rendering and explanation which they pronounce "the only rational interpretation;" a bold and presumptuous statement on the part of tyros, where masters fail, or withhold their hand as Hupfeld does. V. 7. "As he that plows and divides in the earth, our bones are scattered at the mouth of Sheol." This is the complaint of the people; the point of comparison being the turning over and crushing of the ground by the plow. V. 9. יָחַר. I prefer annexing this word to the first member of the verse, though it is contrary to the accents to do so; *together*. As now pointed, I take the meaning to be *wholly, altogether*.

CXLII. Not a Davidic Psalm as the inscription says, specifying it as a prayer when David was in the cave, but leaving it uncertain whether at Adullam or Engedi. V. 4, the first three words of this verse belong to the preceding one, "when my spirit was overwhelmed in me." This is followed by, "But thou knowest my path," etc. The word translated *prison* in the eighth verse, meaning *distress*, seems to have suggested *cave* in the title. V. 8, not as Jennings and Lowe say, "thou hast dealt bountifully," etc.; but, "for thou doest good to me."

CXLIII. This Psalm is an echo of several in the older books and its tone resembles that of the preceding one. Like its immediate predecessors, it must not be assigned to David. V. 3, translate, "the everlasting dead," those who are dead forever. Compare Eccl. xii. 5; Jer. li. 39, 57. V. 6, "my soul is as a land thirsty after thee." V. 9, כִּסִּיתִי Gesenius and others render this verb *to hide*, implying flight for covert; but this signification must be rejected, especially as the verb is joined with אֵלַי *to thee*. The true reading is הִסִּיתִי with which the Septuagint and Luther agree. "To thee I have fled for refuge." V. 10, "lead me upon an even land," not "a land of uprightness." There is no need for altering אֶרֶץ into אֶרֶץ, with Hupfeld, though the change is favored by the analogy of xxvii. 11 and is followed by Luther.

CXLIV. v. 2, "my people" is right. The word should not be altered into "peoples" as it is by many, contrary to the authority of the Septuagint. V. 4, "man is like the breath;" v. 14, "our oxen are heavy (with young); there is no rent (in our walls), no sallying forth." A state of plenty and peace is meant, without the necessity of rushing forth from the walls of the city to meet and repel a besieging enemy. The translation given by Lowe and Jennings is both far-fetched and unnatural, though not wholly new.

CXLIV. This Psalm is chiefly taken from former ones, especially from the xviiith. Hence it has little originality. Of course David was not the author, as stated in the title. The last part (vs. 12-15) is entirely separate from the preceding. A fragment was joined to the Psalm by some later hand, introduced by אֲשֶׁר which has no proper antecedent. The abrupt commencement has given rise to many conjectures. V. 12, "that our sons may be" is incorrect. It is better to omit the pronoun in a translation; or if it is thought desirable to represent it in English, we may supply a verb to it, "*who makes our sons,*" etc. Ewald conjectures that a later poet worked over an old poem, adding the words of the 15th verse and prefixing the pronoun. "We whose sons are as plants, etc. . . . Oh, happy is the people in such a state; yea blessed is the people whose God is Jehovah." The hypothesis is too artificial to be adopted; though he says that no other judgment can be formed of the little piece.

CXLV. The title attributes to David, but wrongly, the authorship of the Psalm, which is post-exilic. It is alphabetical, but the letter *nun* is wanting, and therefore a verse is supplied by the Septuagint and Syriac versions. There is no reason for thinking that the Psalm had such a verse at first. The 16th verse is rightly translated in the authorized version; for the noun translated *desire* does not allude to God's *good pleasure*.

CXLVI. This is the first of the five Hallelujah Psalms. The first two words, "praise Yah," are a title, not an integral part of the first verse. The final Hallelujah is a liturgical addition which is absent from the Septuagint. The language is characteristic of a late period, undoubtedly a post-exile one. The LXX. made Haggai and Zechariah its authors.

CXLVII. v. 1. "Praise Yah for He is good; sing praises to our God for He is gracious; praise is becoming." זָמַר the infinitive Pi'el should be changed into the imperative זַמְּרִי and the accents altered. The Septuagint arbitrarily divides this Psalm into two, making vs. 12-20 a separate piece, and ascribing both to Haggai and Zechariah, like the cxlvith, the cxlvith and the cxxxviiith, by mere conjecture.

CXLVIII. v. 5. It is fanciful to make the *he* (in b) emphatic, as Calvin does. In v. 6 the English version is right. It is the decree which is inviolable. But Hupfeld, Kamphausen and others render, "and they (the sun, moon, etc.) do not overpass it." V. 14, the noun *praise* refers to God, the subject of praise, "He who is the praise," etc.

CXLIX. v. 9. "A judgment written," that is, God's decree. What is written in the law respecting the destruction of the Canaanites is transferred to the heathen generally; probably, however, the allusion here is not to that written law, but to the fact that God has decreed it, written it in his book as it were.

“This honor have all his saints,” in the received version, is a very doubtful rendering. When a noun is qualified by a demonstrative pronoun as here, both receive the article (comp. Deut. xxi. 3,4), which is absent from both in the present case. Besides, the noun **הָרָר** is specially used of the divine majesty, so that Gesenius is obliged to find another meaning for it in this place, viz. *honor*. I would therefore translate with Hupfeld.” He (God) is the glory of all His saints,” etc., the object of their glory. The conclusion of the Psalm (for the last two words are a liturgical addition) correspond to the commencement, “His praise in the congregation of the saints.”

CL. v. 1, “praise God in his sanctuary (earthly temple); praise Him in the firmament of His power,” i. e., praise Him whose habitation is both earth and heaven.

ERMAN'S EGYPT.¹

BY FREDERICK C. H. WENDEL, PH. D.,

New York City.

This book is an important one, and its first appearance was greeted with joy by scholars and all others interested in Egyptian matters. It is not, indeed, the first book of this kind that has come before the public, but it is the first that embodies in it all the results of recent investigation. Its predecessor, Wilkinson's "*Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*," though excellent in its time is now antiquated and can give the reading public no idea of the present state of Egyptian knowledge. Still this new book has roused in Germany and France quite a storm of opposition, owing to the fact that the writer treats with a sort of disdain the earlier translators of Egyptian manuscripts, saying in his preface that all of the passages explained in his book had been again translated by him and alluding to the abuse of translations in Egyptology. True it is that there has been published a vast number of flighty translations which, instead of giving the true sense of the passages in question, give but very confused notions of what the original text really does say. But then there is a vast difference between work of this sort and the work of men like Brugsch, Chabas, Goodwin and Maspero, to whom we are indebted for many an excellent translation, and without whose labors we would not be by any means so far advanced in Egyptological science. There is, however, no doubt that by far the greater part of the material presented in this book is entirely new, and I may here remark that this is the first book of the kind that strictly separates the various epochs of Egyptian history. To most of the previous writers the Egyptian people were *one* people, and no one thought that there might be a great difference between the subjects of King Chufu (Cheops ab. 2800 B. C.) and those of Amenemhat I. (ab. 2130 B. C.) and again between these and the subjects of Thutmosis III. (ab. 1450 B. C.). In the history of art Perrot et Chipiez (*Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité vol. I.*) had already made this distinction, but in the history of civilization it was Erman who first introduced it.

He has taken it upon himself to treat of Egypt only up to the close of the XX. Dynasty (ab. 1050 B. C.); and I cannot but think he is right. For after this period Egyptian history presents but a dreary spectacle, and for the next 400

¹ "Aegypten und Aegyptisches Leben im Alterthum" geschildert von Adolph Erman. 2 vols Tübingen, 1885 and 1888.

years we have no documents that can give us any data for the history of Egyptian civilization. The last king of the XX. Dynasty, *Ramses XII.*,¹ was dethroned by the high priest of Amon in Thebes, *Herihor* whose successors ruled in Egypt over a century, when they in their turn were driven from the throne, about 950 B. C., by *Sheshonk*, a Lybian, the Shishak of the Bible, the conqueror of Jerusalem, whose dynasty, the XXII., in its turn had to give way to the Aethiopian, whose rule over Egypt was ended by Assurhaddon's and Assurbanipal's invasions of Egypt. The time of the Psammetichs is a renaissance, but the rulers are of Lybian stock, and the Egyptian people no longer is what it had been 500 years earlier. The centuries had not passed over the land without leaving deeply cut changes to mark their course. It is with full justice that our author remarks at the close of his third chapter, that if by some piece of magic a noble of the time of Chufu (ab. 2800 B. C.) had been transplanted to the court of Ramses III., he would have believed himself in a strange land, and the accompanying woodcut aptly illustrates this remark.

The general arrangement of the book cannot but be considered excellent. In a short introduction our author treats of the reports the Greek writers give of Egypt, and touches upon the monumental records of the country itself as well as the accounts of the Old Testament. He then gives a brief history of the deciphering of the Egyptian script. The first three chapters of the book are, in matter of fact, also introductory, treating of the geography, ethnography and history of Ancient Egypt. These chapters are not original and our writer does not wish to have them so considered. He has, however, used the works of his predecessors with singular judgment and has treated the subjects under consideration briefly and well. Specially commendable is what he says in the first chapter on the geography of Ancient Egypt. In the second chapter, where he speaks of the ethnography of Egypt, he skillfully avoids the knotty question of the "urheimath." He considers the Egyptian race as aboriginal, even if their language should prove to have been forced on them by a foreign invader, much as Anglo-Saxon was forced on the aboriginal Briton and as the Arabic tongue has been forced on the modern Egyptian. It is of importance here to note that the Egyptians considered themselves aborigines. They designate only their own people as "men" *rometu*; the other peoples may be Lybians, Negroes or Asiatics, but "men" they are not. The third chapter is a very skillfully written epitome of Egyptian history. In his chronology he follows *Eduard Meyer's* so-called "approximate dates" which are the *latest* dates for the era in question. If we

¹ Usually but incorrectly called Ramses XIII. The Ramses XII. of Weidemann and others is a fiction. The stele usually attributed to him has been proven by Erman, *Aeg. Zeitschr.*, 1883, p. 54, seq., to have been composed in Persian times by the priests of Chonsu, in order to celebrate his greatness. The whole story related on the said stele is of a mythical character; and it is not to be considered a historical record. The king mentioned in the stele is probably meant to be Ramses II.

thus say King Suefru ruled about 2830 B. C. we would not have this regarded as an exact date; we merely mean that he cannot have ruled *later*, leaving it an open question how long *before* this period his reign really does fall. These approximate dates are of great convenience to the historian, and it would not be amiss, if they were generally adopted until we can give more exact dates.

It is with the 4th chapter that the author's own work begins, a full critique of which would take up more space than I could take for a review of this chapter. In this and the following chapters are treated of: 1) the king and his court, 2) the government of the country, 3) the police and courts of justice, 4) the family, 5) the house, 6) dress, 7) entertainments, 8) religion, 9) cult of the dead, 10) science, 11) literature, 12) fine arts, 13) agriculture, 14) the industrial arts, 15) commerce, and, 16) warfare.

In the 4th chapter, then, he gives a review of the titlature of the king, his various functions, his coronation, the court and court etiquette, touching also upon the harem life. The next two chapters treat of the civil government of the country, the 5th under the old and middle empires (abt. 2830-1900 B. C.), the 6th under the new empire (abt. 1530-1050). Perhaps no part of the entire work is more ably written and presents more new material than these two chapters. It is a strikingly lifelike picture of Egyptian official life that he depicts to us. I would like to call special attention to what he says in the 5th chapter on the titles of the officials, the power of the nomarchoi in the middle empire (abt. 2130-1900) and social conditions of this time. In the following chapter, which treats of the civil government under the new empire, are of special note the paragraphs showing the difference between the hierarchy of this and the preceding epochs, as also those treating of the slaves of the king, who were in large part of foreign origin; and it is an important position that these foreigners hold in the state, some of them ranking as princes. All of these slaves bore Egyptian names, while some have retained their old names besides. We thus know of a Lybian by the name of *Ynene* and a Phoenician by the name of *Maharba'al* (מַהֲרַבְעֵל)¹ at the court of Ramses III., as also of a Canaanite by the name of *Ben Mat'ana* (בִּנְמַטָּן) son of *Jupa'a* (יַפְעָה) from *Djarbasana* (צַרְבַּשָׁן) at the court of Merenptah. We thus see, and this is a fact Erman does not state, that the Hebrew legend of Joseph is not so unfounded as some critics would have us believe. Of the many foreign slaves that attained high rank one or the other may have belonged to some Hebrew tribe and perhaps the memory of this fact lived with the people who, not uninfluenced by some Egyptian tales, like that of the Two Brothers, in course of time

¹ Maharba'al in Phoen. מַהֲרַבְעֵל, Greek μαάρβαλ and μαάρβαρ, Latin, Maharbal and Maherb-al, *dos aut praemium Baal*, "gift of Baal" (Gesen. *Monumenta*, etc., p. 409), cf. Hebrew מַהֲרֵי Gesen.¹⁰ s. v. Names with this signification are quite frequent in the other Semitic languages. Thus the Babyl. *Nadin*, probably abbreviated and originally compounded with the name of a deity. Also cf. Eg. *Amenerdas*, "Amon gives her"—the name of the last Aethiopic queen of Egypt.

weaved about their fortunate brother the romantic story we read in the Old Testament.¹ Interesting is also what he says of the scribes and the archives, the relations between officials and their superiors and the social conditions of the period under consideration, in which connection he enters more deeply into the life of the laboring class, giving the history of two great strikes, one in the 29th year of Ramses III. and one in the reign of Ramses IX. In the next chapter which treats of the police organization and the administration of justice, he analyzes the so-called Papyrus Abbot, which is the official record of a criminal procedure against an audacious band of robbers that invested the necropolis of Thebes in the reign of Ramses IX. (abt. 1100 B. C.) He then speaks of the administration of justice and gives an account of the great conspiracy against the life of Ramses III. Of interest is also what he says in this chapter on contracts. The following four chapters I need hardly treat in detail. Suffice it to say that they give a vast deal of new and interesting information on the family, the private houses, the dress and the amusements of this most interesting of ancient peoples. The twelfth chapter, on religion, is perhaps the weakest part of the entire book. Indeed the author feels this himself, for he says he had rather left it unwritten. It certainly is quite impossible to give a halfway adequate account of the Egyptian religion in the space allotted to it in this work. But what he does give is generally correct, only that he does not, in my opinion, lay sufficient stress upon the trinities which play a great part in the Egyptian religion. But he has done well in laying great stress on the local deities, as also on the gradual process of assimilation which finally culminated in a solar monotheism. In all probability it was the priesthood of Heliopolis that first set up this doctrine; but an Egyptian king, Amenophis IV., was destined to be its prophet. The history of this movement up to its final collapse is well depicted. What he says of mythology is also very scant, but the chief points are touched. After this brief survey of the religion, he devotes the remainder of the chapter to the temple and the priesthood.

The following chapter, on the cult of the dead, is a brief account of the ancient Egyptian ideas of life after death, their tombs and burial rites. The fourteenth chapter which treats of science, he quite naturally opens with an account of the schools and teaching in ancient Egypt, and from this he goes on to speak of the epigraphy. He then treats of the various sciences known to the ancient Egyptians. They were theology, which busied itself chiefly with commentaries on the ancient religious writings, of which commentaries he gives a well-chosen example; history, which consists mainly in annals of the kings; astronomy, which they brought to some perfection and which they needed for their calendar,

¹ This story having so many legendary accretions, it is futile to seek after the name of Joseph in the Eg. monuments and to attempt to reconstruct his alleged Egyptian name from that given by the Bible, which may only be an attempt to get something that has an Egyptian sound to it. Such an attempt at explanation as Prof. Lansing gives in *HEBRAICA*, IV., p. 44, is utterly wrong.

arithmetic, elementary geometry, and magic. The following chapter is a brief résumé of the history of Egyptian literature. In chapter sixteen he gives a very brief sketch of Egyptian art, quite inadequate, of course, as the scope of the subject requires a volume or two, such as *Perrot and Chipiez's Histoire de l'Art*, etc. Of interest are also the following chapters, of which the seventeenth is the first adequate account of agriculture as practiced by the ancient Egyptians, and of which the eighteenth presents some new material on the subject of the industrial arts. In the nineteenth chapter, on commerce, he describes the means of conveyance, gives a vivid picture of internal commerce, in which connection he speaks of the ancient Egyptian markets, reproducing some representations of market scenes in the time of the old empire (ab. 2800 B. C.). The last chapter gives a very interesting and instructive account of the modes of warfare practiced by the ancient Egyptians.

On the whole, this book is very readable. The subjects under consideration are briefly, but, for the greater part adequately treated. The illustrations are chosen with great tact, and are well reproduced. A special advantage the book possesses, is that the various chapters bear the character of monographs, and can be read independently of the rest of the work. The index of passages explained, too, is of great assistance, especially to the scholar, making reference to the book easy and rapid. The book is thus of almost equal value to the general public and to the specialist, who is enabled by the copious references in the foot-notes to verify every opinion advanced by the writer. In fact it is one of the few books that avoid the extremes of being too popular, on one side, and too scientific on the other. I can, then, safely recommend the book to all those who would make themselves acquainted with life in ancient Egypt.

JEWISH GRAMMARIANS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

BY PROF. MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH. D.,

University of Pennsylvania.

VI.

ABU ZAKARIYYĀ YAḤYĀ BEN DAWŪD HAYYUḠ.

With this grammarian there begins a new period in the history of Jewish grammar. By a single stroke he overthrew the false methods of his predecessors which found their culmination in the grammatical system of Menahem b. Saruḡ.¹ Superior to the merely negative criticism of Donaš b. Labraṭ, Abu Zakariyyā Yaḥyā ben Dawūd Hayyug proved to be the real critic of Menahem by offering in the place of the latter's chaotic theory of the weak verbs in Hebrew—the pivotal point of discussion at this juncture—one that at once commended itself to the scholars of the day by its simplicity and adaptability.

We know but little of the life of Hayyug as, for brevity's sake, we will henceforth call him. He was born about the middle of the 10th century in Fez and died in the first quarter of the 11th century, but neither the year in which he was born nor that in which he died can at present be fixed with any degree of certainty. It appears from a reference in Mošê Ibn Esra's rhetorical work *Kitâb al-Muḥâdârât*² that he left his native city and crossed over into Spain, making his home in the city of Cordova. There is every reason to believe that he here came into personal contact with Menahem ben Saruḡ, and some scholars are of the opinion that the Yehudâ b. Dawîd who appears among the "Talmîdê Menahem," i. e. "Pupils of Menahem" who replied to the cruel and unjust invective of Donaš,³ is identical with the subject of our sketch. This, however, must be considered extremely doubtful.⁴ At the same time it is quite possible that Hayyug, in common with so many of his contemporaries, was for a time an adherent of Menahem's system. What the position was which he occupied at Cordova, we are equally at a loss to say. That he opened a school there and surrounded himself by pupils to whom he imparted his novel grammatical theories is beyond reasonable doubt, and we even know the names of some of his pupils, but we cannot

¹ See *HEBRAICA*, Vol. IV., Nos. 1 and 2.

² Munk, Notice sur Abou-l-walid Merwan Ibn Ġanaḥ, *Journal Asiatique*, 1850, II., p. 375.

³ Published by S. G. Stern under the title *Liber Responsionum*. Wien, 1870.

⁴ See the arguments in my Dissert. *Abu Zak.*, etc., und seine zwei grammat. Schriften (Gies-sen, 1885), pp. 8-10.

say for a certainty whether he wrote the works upon which his reputation chiefly rests,—one a treatise on weak verbs in Hebrew, the other a treatise on verbs with reduplicated second stem-letter,—at Cordova, although this, too, is highly probable. In addition to these two books, he also issued a short essay on the accents, and a fourth work of which the title alone is known to us, “The Book of Spices,” and which, despite the strange-sounding name, was probably also of a grammatical character. All of these were written in Arabic by Ḥayyūḡ. The treatise on the accents is not of much value, and may be passed over with a mere mention. Turning to his works on the verbs, the two treatises may properly be regarded as one book, devoted exclusively to the elucidation of the theory propounded in the introductory chapter, namely, that the stem of every Hebrew verb must consist of at least three letters. It is not a mere accident that Ḥayyūḡ wrote in Arabic, whereas Menahem availed himself of a forcible and graceful Hebrew style which he possessed, for it was through his study of the Arabic grammarians that Ḥayyūḡ was led to the discovery that, whatever we may think of it to-day, was of supreme importance for his days. The adoption of **פעל** as the standard paradigm for the conjugation of the verbs is quite a sufficient proof of his indebtedness to Arabic models, for a more awkward paradigm for Hebrew could hardly have been selected. In Arabic, where the Ayin can receive a Dageš forte, as much as any other letter, there was of course no objection against the use of this stem, which readily suggested itself to Arabic scholars from the fact of its being employed as the technical term for the “verb,” but had Ḥayyūḡ been a more independent worker than he was, he would certainly have made a better choice. The objections against the use of **פעל** do not seem to have occurred to him, though his successors were not long in recognizing this fact. So for example Abraham Ibn Esra proposes **שמל** as better suited, while Kāmhi adopts **פקר**. From the Arabic **فعل**, also, Ḥayyūḡ takes his designation of the first, second and third letters of the stem, as the Pê, the Ayin and the Lamedh of the stem. But there are other and even more direct proofs of his adoption of principles long since laid down by Arabic grammarians. In his explanation of irregular forms he is especially fond of attributing them to a strong tendency in language against avoiding combinations of vowels and consonants difficult to pronounce. Time and again he says of a form that it has deviated from the norm **لاستخفاف** (lî'stiḥfâf) for the sake of “easing” the word. Now this same principle is a favorite one in the grammatical schools of the Arabs, and in fact the very same technical term is used to designate it. Again Ḥayyūḡ's ingenious theory about the pronunciation of the Š'wâ, of which I shall speak further on, was evidently suggested to him by the 'Imâlâ of the Arabic grammarians. There is therefore no reason to doubt that it was in virtue of the constant comparison he was instituting between the Hebrew

and the Arabic, that he was brought to set up the principle of the triliteral character of the Hebrew stems.

The Arabic grammarians never seem to have had any difficulties, or at all events not much difficulty, with their weak verbs. They knew very well that the disappearance of the initial Wâw of the stems *primæ wâw* in the Imperfect of the first form, was due to contraction. True, their language did not present so many irregularities in this particular as the Hebrew. In the case of the *mediæ wâw*, for instance, they had at least the graphical *Elif* in the third person Perfect to guide them, whereas in Hebrew, with the exception of such a form as קאם (Hos. x. 14) there was only the long vowel under the first radical. Then again the distinction between the *mediæ wâw* and the *mediæ yodh* was more sharply observed than in Hebrew. At all events it was the Arabic that led Hayyug̃ on to the right track. After explaining what he means by his theory and showing up the absurdities to which the theory of Menahem was bound to lead, attacking Menahem severely, without, however, directly mentioning the name of his eminent predecessor, he proceeds to an examination of the vowels, of the Š'wâ, of the weak letters or אֲתִיּוֹת הַסֵּתֶר, as he calls them, the Alef, the Wâw and the Yôdh. After showing the conditions under which these letters disappear apparently from the word, he takes up the בְּנִדְכַּפַּת and sets forth their peculiarities and thereupon returns once more to the above-mentioned weak letters. He shows, by adducing many examples, how often these letters interchange with one another in Hebrew. So for example we find אֲתַחְבֵּר יְהוֹשֻׁפָּט (2 Chron. xx. 35) for הֲתַחְבֵּר ; תְּלוּאִים (Hos. xi. 7) for תְּלוּיִם ; (Josh. x. 26) אִשְׂרָאֵלָה (1 Chron. xxv. 2) for יִשְׂרָאֵלָה ; אִישִׁי (1 Chron. ii. 13) for יִשִּׁי ; פְּנוּאֵל (Gen. xxxii. 31) for פְּנִיאֵל, and so we have both עֹבֵל (Gen. x. 28) and עִיבֵל (1 Chron. i. 22). He dwells at considerable length upon this point and comes to the conclusion that this interchange is due in some cases to a similarity between the pronunciation of these letters, but must in other cases be accounted for on the ground of an etymological interchange. His theory with regard to the pronunciation of the Š'wâ is an interesting one. There are three distinctions to be noted. When a consonant with Š'wâ Mobile at the beginning of a word or syllable is followed by either of the letters א "ה" "ח" "ע" the Š'wâ is attracted by the vowel given to these letters. Thus in תֵּאֲנֶה the Š'wâ follows the Šerê under the Tav and the word is pronounced T'ênâ, and so קָחוּ is sounded K'hû. Secondly, when the consonant following the Š'wâ Mobile is a Yodh, the Š'wâ receives an i-sound, no matter what the vowel accompanying the Yodh may be. So e. g. וִידְעוּ is pronounced Wyâd'û and equally וִידְעוּ Wyêd'û. Thirdly, in the case of the other letters, the vowel-sound of the Š'wâ is Pataḥ. Thus בְּרַכָּה b'rakha, בְּדִיל b'dîl, and the like.

This principle was adopted by almost all the successors of Hayyug̃ and is found in the works of Ibn Ġanah, Ibn Ezra, Parḥon and the Kamḥîs. But the most important portion of these introductory remarks for our purposes is that bearing on the peculiarities of the “weak” or “hidden” letters. There are two distinct ways, according to Hayyug̃, in which these letters may be used. In the first place they may be vocalized—either a full vowel or a Š‘wâ—and pronounced like the other letters, and, secondly, they may lack vowels, “be hidden, concealed and not pronounced at all,” to quote him literally. An example of the first is וַיֵּאסֶר (Ex. XIV. 6) for Alef, שְׁלֹחֵי (Job XXXVII. 26) for Wâw and יִדְבֹר (freq.) for Yodh.

What he means by the second, we would to-day express by saying that these letters often have no other purpose in the verb than that of lengthening the preceding vowels. In short, he refers to the use of these consonants as *matres lectionis*. From this usage to their being entirely “hidden” from view in the word, is but a short step. Once admitting that they may be written without being pronounced, there is no difficulty, thinks Hayyug̃, in supposing that they may be omitted, since they do not affect the pronunciation of the word. In this way he would explain the disappearance of the weak letters in certain forms of the verbs; but, he says, there will always be some forms in which the weak letter that the stem contains will reappear so that the letters of the stem may in every case be determined. Moreover, when these letters are “concealed,” to use the term which he constantly employs, there is generally a compensation in some form or the other, either by a lengthening of the vowel or a change in the vowel, as e. g. הַקִּים for הִוְקִים. The weak point in this chapter is the constant confusion between the use of the vowel letters as mere *matres lectionis*, where of course a *plene* or *defective* method of writing may be chosen and the assimilation or contraction of these letters when they form an integral part of the stem. But although he may be wrong in regarding the *defective* method of writing as a bridge to pass over to the “concealed” character of these letters, the conclusions at which he arrives and the facts to which he calls attention are correct. Having made his point clear and held up his theory to a full view from all sides, he plunges into his subject proper—an examination of all the verbs, primæ Yodh, mediæ Wâw, tertiæ Hê and the mediæ geminatæ. In each case he applies the laws laid down in the introductory chapters above alluded to, and in this way explains all irregularities incident to these classes of verbs. As an example of his method, we may take the verb אָפַה the stem of which, according to Menahem’s principle, would be the single letter Pe, because in וְתִפְּחוּ (I. Sam. XXVIII. 24) the Alef and Hê have disappeared. But how does Hayyug̃ account for this fact? “The Alef,” he says, “which belongs to the stem,¹ as shown by the form אָפַה, has been changed

¹ Hayyug̃ uses **الاصل** el-’asl, like the Arabic grammarians, knowing of no distinction between stem and root.

into a Wâw and this Wâw is "concealed," the word, if written *plene*, being וְתִפְּהוּ. This Wâw accordingly is a substitute for the first letter of the stem. According to Hayyug̃ the Alef may be "concealed" in precisely the same way as a Wâw. He places the form תִּכְרֶה (2 Sam. XIX. 14) on the same plane with the contraction that is constant in the first person Imperfect Kal of this verb. There is no distinction, as already pointed out, between a "concealment" of any of the weak letters when they are *matres lectionis* and when they form part of the stem. These two principles, first, the interchange among the letters "א" ה" ו", the Alef becoming a Wâw, the Hê being written for Alef, and vice-versa, the Wâw changing into Yodh, and again the Yodh becoming a Wâw,—it being immaterial to him whether the change is merely graphical or etymological,—and, secondly, the possibility of "concealing" these letters, help him over all difficulties. After finishing with the primæ Alef, he takes up in the same way the mediæ Wâw, introducing them by some additional remarks of a general character. So again the class tertiæ Hê are preceded by an introduction, and with these he comes to the end of his first treatise.

The second treatise is entirely taken up with the mediæ geminatae. Here the principle of 'Istihfâf plays the most prominent rôle. On the ground of the natural desire to lighten the pronunciation, he explains the contraction of the two letters of a stem into one. It is unnecessary to adduce examples. Hayyug̃, it will be seen, is extremely methodical. He sets down his principles and then applies them, with logical exactness. True, he does not occupy himself with an investigation of the principles themselves. Their truth is sufficiently demonstrated to him by their power to account for the facts.

The strict logic of his work was no doubt the feature that struck his contemporaries very forcibly. It was not long before his views gained the day. The popularity of his works is shown by the two Hebrew translations of them which were made by two eminent Spanish scholars, Moše Gikaṭilia¹ and Abraham Ibn Esra.² The Arabic original, however, still remains unedited. Three manuscript copies are at present known to scholars, two in the Bodleian Library, and one in the Royal Library at St. Petersburg. There are besides two fragments, one in the Royal Library at Berlin, and a second in the British Museum.³ The desirability of publishing the Arabic original of these treatises which play so important a rôle in the *grammatical* productions of the generations succeeding Hayyug̃, has long been acknowledged.⁴ And now that all the known works of

¹ Published by John W. Nutt, שלשה ספר, דקדוק, London, 1870.

² Dukes in Dukes & Ewald, Beitrage Zur Gesch. d. Aelttest. Erkl. d. AT, Vol. III., Stuttgart, 1844.

³ Described by the writer in Proc. of Am. Or. Ass. for Oct., 1888.

⁴ See Jos. Derenbourg in the Introduction to Opusculs & Traites d'Abuwalid Merwan Ibn Djanah (Paris, 1880) p. 119.

Ḥayyug's great successor and pupil, Abuwalid Merwan Ibn Ḡanaḥ, who will be treated of in the next sketch, are in our hands in the language in which he wrote them, it is all the more important that the same justice be done to Abu Zakariyyâ Ḥayyug.¹

¹ The writer has had all the material ready for such a publication for some time and hopes to be enabled to edit the Arabic text at an early date. For a specimen chapter of the treatise on weak verbs, see the dissertation above referred to, pp. 19-22. The Arabic titles of the two treatises are

كتاب الافعال ذوات حروف اللين

and

كتاب الافعال ذوات المثليين

Ḡikātillia calls them ספר אותיות הנח והמשך and ספר פעלי הכפל. Ibn Ezra uses the same designations, except that he omits the last word in the title of the first.

THE USE OF PESIQ IN THE PSALMS.¹

BY PROF. A. J. MAAS, S. J.,

Woodstock College, Md.

The frequent occurrence of Pesiq in the Psalms makes a study of its use in that part of the Old Testament both important and interesting. Before entering, however, upon such a study we briefly state the common explanation of Pesiq which hitherto stands without serious dispute. Pesiq is said to be closely related to the accents, though itself is not an accent; its effect is held to be contrary to that of Maqqeph. This latter statement must be taken in a qualified way; for to say that Pesiq is as much disjunctive as Maqqeph is conjunctive is incorrect. Maqqeph unites two distinct words into one, so far as accentuation is concerned; Pesiq does not divide one word into two, but only preserves the disunion of distinct words. Maqqeph destroys and Pesiq emphasizes the individuality of distinct words. In reading, such emphasis is either necessary or euphonic. The distinctiveness of two words is necessarily emphasized, if else a misunderstanding would follow; but when such emphasis secures mere solemnity and distinctness of enunciation, it is euphonic.

Now we may state such canons concerning the use of Pesiq in the Psalms as are deducible after even a slight acquaintance with the facts:

- I. Pesiq prevents misunderstanding.
- II. Pesiq secures distinctness of enunciation.
- III. Pesiq renders the reading dignified and impressive.

To forestall certain difficulties that might arise from a wrong impression, we remind the reader that the truth of a statement does not imply the truth of its converse. It is by causing the reader to pause a little or, at least, to read very slowly, that Pesiq effects these three results. Dagghesh lene following Pesiq, even when a vowel precedes, tells us that much.

Here it may be objected, that not Pesiq alone but that all disjunctive accents indicate a pause. The indication of a pause in reading cannot, therefore, be the specific value of Pesiq. But the difficulty vanishes by the consideration that disjunctive accents indicate a pause and a modulation; to indicate a pause only may, therefore, be said to be the specific effect of Pesiq. A more serious objection is raised by those who maintain that Pesiq occurs after disjunctive accents. If,

¹The common text serves as basis in this article. The text of Baer and Delitzsch, and Wickes' *Treatise on Hebrew Accentuation* will find their due consideration in a final article on Pesiq in the three books. Legarmeh, too, will then appear in its true light.

then, its value consists in the indication of a pause, why employ it in places where a pause is indicated already? We may answer, in the common way, that in those places the pause is to be lengthened and thus vindicate its proper effect to Pesiq. But a thorough investigation of the use of Pesiq in the Psalms supplies us with another answer. We deny that in the Psalms and in the other parts of the Old Testament where the poetic system of accentuation is employed, Pesiq ever occurs after a disjunctive accent. Instances without number are, of course, brought up against this; but they too are without weight. Let us examine them singly:

1. After *Mercha* preceded by *Mahpach* superior Pesiq occurs three times in the Psalms: 5:13; 55:20; 86:1. All three instances are of a doubtful character. Pesiq is doubtful in two cases: a) when the Massoretic notes declare it so either by the note **לא פסיק**, or by giving a different reading in which the accent preceding Pesiq is changed; b) when Pesiq is omitted in other standard editions, such as the London and the Paris Polyglots, the edition of van der Hooght, etc. To return now to our adverse instances: In 5:13 the foot-note says **לא פסיק**; in 55:20 the notes give another reading, in which *Mercha* precedes Pesiq; in 86:1 the Walton Polyglot omits Pesiq, the Paris Polyglot reads it, but changes the preceding accent to *Mercha*.

2. After *prepositive Tiphcha* Pesiq occurs twice: 31:3 and 118:25; in both cases the notes say **לא פסיק**.

3. After *Rebhia'* Pesiq is found six times: 9:14; 31:12; 68:36; 86:8; 130:20; 146:5. In 86:8 and 146:5 it is canceled in the foot-notes; in 9:14 and 31:12 other readings are given, in both of which *Qadhma* precedes Pesiq. In 103:20 the London Polyglot omits Pesiq, and in 68:36 the Paris Polyglot does the same. Thus the Psalms contain no undisputed instance in which Pesiq follows *Rebhia'*.

4. After *Pazer* Pesiq occurs but once in 10:14; the notes canceling the text reading. This case, too, is more than doubtful.

5. To extend our observations to the other portions of the Old Testament in which the poetic system of accentuation is employed, four more instances must be considered. In Prov. 7:7 and in Job 30:16 Pesiq follows *Rebhia'*, but the Paris and London Polyglots omit Pesiq in both passages. In Job 10:15 and 24:14 Pesiq is read after *Pazer*, but is omitted in the London Polyglot, though the Paris edition retains it.

We may, therefore, safely assert that in the poetic system of accentuation there is not a single instance in which Pesiq follows a disjunctive accent. The actual occurrence of it in our received Hebrew text is readily explained. The chief aim of the successive editions being accuracy, any point or accent according to the received principles of criticism not evidently superfluous or spurious has been admitted into the text. Now, concerning Pesiq there never existed any definite principles of criticism, the nature and value of the sign being too little known. Thus every Pesiq introduced by transcribers has been recopied into

other editions. Such an introduction of Pesiq might, at times, be even willful. Suppose a more than commonly acute scribe had noticed the occurrence of Pesiq between two words, the first of which ended in the same consonant with which the second began; his discovery would naturally lead him to write Pesiq in Ps. 68:36, for instance, though here Rebhia' preceded. For Rebhia' and the rest of the accents were but meaningless strokes of the pen for our inventive genius.

Now we come to the use of Pesiq after conjunctive accents, its only use, as we maintain. Before stating any rules more definite than the above given three canons, we shall enumerate the facts relating to Pesiq and classify them according to their most striking headings.

1. After *Mercha* Pesiq occurs eighteen times.

a. Six of these instances are doubtful: 40:16; 55:20; 67:6; 75:1; 89:52, and 108:4. "Doubtful" is used here and hereafter in the sense that the notes either cancel the textual Pesiq or indicate another reading in which the accent preceding Pesiq is changed.

b. In ten cases Pesiq precedes the name of God, which is in the vocative in six of these instances: 67:4; 89:50; 94:3; 119:52; 119:157; 143:9. In 66:8 Pesiq follows a vocative, serving as an exclamation mark. In 10:13; 77:8, and 78:65 it indicates the subject of the sentence, thus preventing a possible misunderstanding. The רשע אל'ים of 10:13 illustrates what has been said.

c. Once, in 139:19, Pesiq follows the name of God, preventing a misunderstanding and a blasphemy.

d. In 65:11 Pesiq follows ה and secures a distinct pronunciation of Mappiq. If we accept the qabbalistic interpretation of the word followed by Pesiq in this case, we may reduce it to c. In 75:1, too, Pesiq occurs, but is omitted in the Walton Polyglot.

2. After *Munach* Pesiq stands seventeen times.

a. Nine of these instances are doubtful: 40:6; 47:9; 57:5; 78:24; 89:52; 100:3; 108:4; 115:7; 116:1.

b. Before the name of God Pesiq is found four times, in three of which instances the divine name is in the vocative case: 57:10; 59:2; 74:8. In 58:7 a misunderstanding is prevented.

c. In the three remaining cases Pesiq intervenes between repeated words to secure a dignified and impressive reading. In 35:21 we read האח האח; in 61:9, יום יום; in 137:7, ערו ערו. In 7:17 Pesiq is omitted in several editions.

3. After *Mercha-Zarqa* Pesiq is found six times.

a. In 40:16 it is, however, doubtful.

b. Four times it intervenes between repeated words: in 41:13; 89:53, and 72:19 between ואמן ואמן, in 70:4 between האח האח.

c. Once, 10:3 Pesiq occurs before the divine name in the accusative.

4. After *Mercha-Mahpach* Pesiq stands twice. In 9:17 it is doubtful. In 68:21 it follows the name of God and secures also an easier understanding of the text. Besides, distinctness is demanded here, since ל immediately precedes and follows Pesiq.

5. After *Munach-superior* Pesiq occurs six times.

a. In 36:1 and 43:5 it is doubtful.

b. In 69:1 and 61:1 it stands at the end of a clause in the title of the Psalm. In 104:24 it follows an exclamation and may be looked upon as an exclamation mark. Van der Hooght's edition omits it in 142:4.

6. After *Shalshleth* Pesiq is read twenty-three times.

a. Its occurrence in 44:9 is doubtful.

b. In nineteen cases Pesiq stands after the word immediately following Athnach and in most cases emphasizes this word as parallel with or opposed to a word of the preceding half of the verse. One or two illustrations must suffice; the other occurrences will be indicated without further comment. In 20:8 וְאֵלֶיךָ is pointedly opposed to the וְאֵלֶיךָ...וְאֵלֶיךָ of the preceding clause; in 33:12 הָעַם is emphatically parallel to the preceding הָגִי. Something similar might be said of 7:6; 12:8; 29:11; 41:8; 49:14; 50:6; 52:5; 66:7; 67:5; 77:4; 89:2; 89:3; 94:17; 131:1; 143:6; 143:11; 146:3.

c. In the remaining three cases Pesiq does not follow the word preceded by Athnach; in 68:15 and 137:9 there is no Athnach at all in the verse, but in the former passage Pesiq follows the divine name; in the latter it indicates the end of the clause. In 72:3 it emphasizes הָרִים as parallel to the preceding נִבְעוֹת.

7. After *Qadhma-Mahpach* our sign stands four times.

a. In 9:17 and 55:16 the textual reading is doubtful.

b. In 50:16 Pesiq indicates opposition between the word it follows and the preceding emphatic word; in 65:6 it indicates the real meaning of the passage by uniting an adverbial qualification to its proper verb. We shall see later that in these services it does not differ from the Pesiq which follows Qadhma. Hence we might have enumerated these cases under No. 10.

9. After *Mahpach-Rebhia'* Pesiq appears in 118:15. Van der Hooght's edition omits it in that place, and the London edition of 1822 substitutes Mahpach or Munach instead of Mahpach-Rebhia'. For brevity sake, two more instances may be enumerated under this number. In 45:5 Pesiq follows *Qadhma-Munach superior*; in 78:24 it occurs after *Mahpach superior*.

10. After *Qadhma* Pesiq is found 251 times.

a. In eleven of these instances it is doubtful: 9:14; 17:3; 31:12; 37:28; 43:5; 45:5; 55:16; 56:10; 142:4; 149:9; 39:5.

b. The name of God precedes Pesiq forty times; in eleven cases it stands in the vocative: 3:8; 7:7; 9:21; 17:1; 28:1; 43:1; 55:24; 57:2; 86:11; 137:7; 140:5. At the end of a clause or phrase Pesiq stands fifteen times. Two cases suffice as

illustrations of this. In 37:34 we read, **קוֹה אֶל-יְהוָה וְשָׁמַר**, where evidently a new sentence begins after Pesiq, though the closing word of the preceding one is marked by Qadhma only. In like manner a new sentence begins after **יְהוָה הִלְלוּ יְהוָה** in 111:1; 112:1; 113:1; 135:1; 147:1; 148:1; 149:1; 150:1, though here, too, **יְהוָה** has a conjunctive accent. The same must be said of 55:20; 96:13; 110:4; 132:11; 144:1; 135:21. In the remaining fourteen instances Pesiq expresses either emphasis, as in 11:1; 42:9; 55:23; 69:36; 98:1; 110:1; 146:10, or it stands like our comma between a complex subject and its predicate, thus facilitating the right understanding of the verse as in 19:10; 29:9; 78:31; 103:17,22; or again it stands before a noun in the construct state, uniting the construct more closely to the following genitive as in 41:13; 106:48. In 55:23 another reason might be assigned for Pesiq; for since the word following it begins with **י**, and since **אֲרֵנִי** was read instead of the preceding **יְהוָה**, Pesiq may be said to secure distinct pronunciation of initial and final consonant.

c. Pesiq precedes the name of God twenty-three times, fifteen of which have the sacred name in the vocative: 5:11; 17:14; 39:13; 40:6; 51:16; 69:14; 92:10; 93:3; 104:24; 106:46; 141:8; 143:7; 44:24; 72:1; 75:2. In 96:10 it stands at the end of a clause; in 81:11; 20:7; 18:13; 48:15 it intervenes between subject and predicate, either because one of those members is complex or because no copula is expressed. In 18:1; 18:51 and 42:3 we may admit Pesiq on account of the special emphasis on the word following it; in 18:51, however, and possibly, also, in 18:1 a misunderstanding is prevented by Pesiq, since it indicates that the following **ל** is not to be taken in the genitive, but in the dative meaning. We might quote under this paragraph, also, 106:48 and 110:1; but in both cases Pesiq enters between the repeated name of God, and in so far as it follows the divine name, both have been enumerated under the preceding division.

d. Pesiq secures distinct pronunciation in 19:7; 101:5; 101:7; 104:35; 143:5; in these cases m, r, b, m, m respectively are the initial and final consonants of its neighboring words.

e. In 7:10; 8:3; 106:48; 108:9 Pesiq stands between repeated words or word-like phrases and secures solemnity of reading; 31:3 and 71:3 may be added here or under the preceding heading. In both cases we read: **לִי לְצוּר**.

f. The end of a clause or sentence is thirty-four times indicated by Pesiq: 2:12; 12:15; 22:27; 25:5; 26:1; 27:1; 32:8; 35:1; 37:1; 41:7; 41:10; 42:5; 48:9; 49:11; 50:21; 57:4; 68:9; 68:19; 74:2; 75:9; 78:20; 78:38; 79:13; 82:5; 90:10; 91:15; 103:1; 112:10; 126:6; 131:2; 138:1; 141:5; 142:5; 144:1. At times there is a full division which would be indicated by our period or semi-colon, as in 26:1; 27:1, etc.; again the end of the protasis is expressed by Pesiq, in which cases it is the equivalent of our comma, as in 48:9; 90:10, etc.; or, in the third place, Pesiq is equal to our quotation marks, as in 12:5; or it indicates the beginning of a relative clause, the relative being not rarely omitted, as in 41:10; 74:2, etc.

g. A special emphasis seems to have been indicated by Pesiq in eighteen cases: 9:7; 18:8; 19:4; 38:12; 39:6; 39:13; 51:16; 79:3; 84:4; 84:12; 90:10; 91:4; 95:10; 122:5; 133:3; 137:3; 142:8; 143:3. The emphatic word is sometimes the nominative absolute, as in 9:7; 90:10, etc.; or it is a word emphatic on account of its parallelism, as in 19:4; 39:13, etc.; or it is an emphatically repeated word, as in 51:6, or finally the emphasis is required by the whole context, as in 18:8; 38:12.

h. Nearly related to the preceding heading of emphasis are those passages in which Pesiq is used before or after proper names and personal pronouns. We have nineteen instances of this kind: 10:14; 24:9; 32:5; 40:6; 42:6; 42:12; 45:5; 45:13; 62:9; 62:13; 68:28; 80:2; 80:3; 87:5; 97:8; 99:4; 99:6; 106:7; 137:1. Several cases have been enumerated here in which a direct address is intended, as in 24:9, "O Gates;" 42:6 and 12, "O my soul;" 45:5 and 62:9, "O nation." Seventeen more instances may be reduced to this heading, "emphasis," though at first sight they do not appear to belong here. They are: 27:5; 35:10; 37:20; 40:4; 40:13; 42:5; 60:2; 65:14; 68:26; 78:4; 78:55; 94:23; 113:9; 129:8; 148:14; 72:18; 104:14. Another case of noted emphasis we have in 44:3, unless we prefer to look upon the double Pesiq that encloses the emphatic word as on our dash.

i. Next we must enumerate the instances in which Pesiq aids the right understanding of the verse. In fifteen cases it precedes the construct state of nouns, thus uniting the construct to its following genitive. They are: 2:2; 18:6; 19:15; 22:30; 31:14; 40:11; 45:2; 76:6; 78:6; 78:49; 93:4; 101:3; 138:2; 141:4; 71:20. It must be added that in 45:2; 71:20; 78:6; 93:4; 141:4 the noun is not followed by a genitive, but by a qualifying adjective.

k. In forty-four cases Pesiq aids the right understanding by indicating whether an adverbial or adjectival qualification belongs to the subject, to the predicate or to the object of the sentence. Such qualifications are expressed by means of a preposition with a noun or a pronoun or by negative particles. Two cases will exemplify this; the rest will be merely enumerated. In 10:14 we read: **ראתה כי-אתה ' עמל וכעס ' תביט**. Shall we render this: "Thou hast seen, for thou art grievousness, and grief thou wilt look on," or "Thou hast seen, for thou wilt look on grievousness and grief"? The double Pesiq tells us, so far as mere mechanism can tell, that grievousness and grief belong together and stand on the same footing. Hence the first rendering is excluded. Again in 18:9 we read: **עלה עשן ' באפו**, literally: "Went up smoke in his anger." Does the qualification "in his anger" belong to "smoke" or to "went up"? The Pesiq shows that it belongs to the whole sentence, i. e., to the verb rather than the subject. Similar occurrences we meet in: 23:5; 27:2; 27:3; 27:9; 31:3; 32:6; 35:26; 39:4; 40:7; 40:10; 40:15; 40:17; 42:5; 48:14; 49:15; 61:3; 62:5; 63:2; 64:6; 66:6; 66:7; 68:7; 68:31; 69:7; 70:5; 72:16; 72:17; 78:5; 79:6; 91:7; 92:8; 100:4; 102:3; 104:35; 117:2; 133:2; 137:6; 141:4; 142:4; 146:7; 147:8; 147:20.

l. Misunderstanding is prevented by means of Pesiq in eighteen other instances; or if no positive misunderstanding is prevented, at least the right understanding is facilitated. Pesiq intervenes between subject and predicate, thus indicating the copula, in 30:6; 37:7; 47:10; 49:12; 54:5; 77:19; 111:10; 144:12. In 1:3; 7:6; 10:9; 19:7; 22:16; 25:7; 84:3; 88:6; 93:3; 140:6 Pesiq helps to clearness as much as in the previous instances; but since the way in which it does so varies in the single cases, we must here be satisfied with a mere enumeration of the passages. A more minute description of each would lengthen our paper considerably.

11. Finally, after *Mahpach* Pesiq occurs 197 times.

a. Nine of these are doubtful: 6:11; 17:3; 37:25; 37:28; 47:9; 57:5; 61:9; 102:27; 115:7.

b. Pesiq follows the name of God nineteen times. In eight of these cases the divine name is in the vocative case: 5:9; 44:2; 50:1; 63:2; 86:14; 89:9; 131:1; 143:1. In nine other passages Pesiq indicates the copula: 11:4; 18:3; 27:1; 28:7; 41:3; 60:8; 68:7; 146:8; 146:9. In 108:8 it serves to join the adverbial qualification to the verb, and in 127:1 it does the same with regard to the negative particle.

c. Pesiq also precedes the name of God in nineteen instances; nine of these present the sacred name in the vocative: 4:2; 39:5; 55:24; 68:19; 77:17; 79:9; 86:12; 97:9; 109:21. In 5:7; 12:18; 72:19 and 118:27 it stands in place of the copula; it adds emphasis in 37:7; 42:10; 98:6 and 55:20; it stands before a noun in the construct state in 43:2 and 20:2.

d. Pesiq secures distinctness and dignity of enunciation in 68:20 and 104:14; in the former case the word is repeated, in the latter the final letter of the preceding word is identical with the initial consonant of the word that follows Pesiq.

e. Pesiq indicates the end of a clause or sentence, like our comma or period, in fourteen cases: 18:31; 22:28; 40:17; 56:1; 56:7; 59:8; 59:12; 73:8; 74:2; 86:9; 86:9 again; 104:26; 112:9; 134:1. Since this and the following division are similar to the various headings given under No. 10, fuller illustrations are not needed.

f. Special emphasis is indicated by Pesiq in twenty-six cases: 1:2; 6:7; 10:7; 12:3; 15:4; 20:6; 21:5; 27:4; 27:8; 28:9; 36:5; 37:14; 44:24; 49:15; 56:8; 62:11; 65:5; 69:21; 71:15; 104:15; 104:25; 127:1; 137:9; 139:16; 142:7; 143:10. We may notice here a characteristic proper to Pesiq following *Mahpach*, namely, that it follows in the majority of cases the first word of the sentence. Pesiq may be said to secure emphasis also in 71:21; 102:20; 104:8; 148:4, though in these cases the emphasis is less striking.

g. To the class of emphasis we may refer also those cases in which Pesiq accompanies a proper name or a personal pronoun. Such are the following twenty-four instances: 3:1; 10:14; 13:6; 31:15; 31:23; 32:7; 35:13; 40:18; 44:3; 52:2; 52:10; 57:5; 59:17; 60:10; 70:6; 71:22; 73:28; 76:8; 81:6; 87:4; 88:14; 109:25; 115:18; 135:11.

h. The right understanding of the text is facilitated by Pesiq in several ways. First, it joins the construct state to its proper genitive. This happens in the following twenty-nine passages: 10:8; 21:10; 31:21; 38:13; 40:3; 43:4; 45:2; 48:12; 55:22; 69:3; 69:5; 69:16; 72:4; 84:7; 90:17; 97:7; 101:2; 101:6; 105:3; 106:5; 109:14; 109:20; 116:3; 116:19; 119:104; 128:3; 138:7; 145:12; 148:13.

i. Pesiq prevents misunderstandings or facilitates the right understanding of passages, in the second place, by indicating the proper subject of adverbial qualifications and conjunctive relations. The passages in which this takes place are the following: 37:1,5; 5:5; 10:13; 16:9; 16:10; 18:50; 23:6; 28:5; 30:13; 32:4; 37:17; 39:7; 42:9; 42:11; 44:4; 51:18; 55:13; 62:4; 62:10; 62:12; 68:17; 68:24; 71:6; 71:18; 73:10; 73:20; 78:21; 79:10; 85:9; 89:50; 94:14; 96:5; 105:45; 109:16; 119:69; 119:128; 132:17. It may be added that nearly all the qualifications of this class are conjunctions, such as "for," "therefore," "that," or interrogative particles.

k. In thirteen more instances does Pesiq prevent a misunderstanding of the text; but it is too hard to reduce them to any greater divisions and too lengthy to explain them singly in full. An enumeration must then suffice: 1:1; 15:5; 18:7; 18:7 again; 19:5; 24:4; 32:9; 57:7; 66:4; 77:8; 111:9; 135:9; 146:6.

In order to complete this sketch of the use of Pesiq in the books in which the poetic system of accentuation prevails, the occurrences of Pesiq in the Books of Proverbs and of Job will be briefly added. What is to be said of Pesiq after disjunctive accents in these books, has been stated above.

1. After *Mercha* Pesiq occurs in Prov. 8:21 and Job 40:6,9. In Proverbs it marks the end of the sentence; in Job 40:6 it seems to give emphasis to the following word, while in Job 40:9 it follows the name of God, thus securing a more solemn reading of the same.

2. After *Munach* Pesiq occurs in Prov. 6:9 after a vocative, and in Job 1:1; 1:16; 1:17; 1:19; 2:11; 11:15; 27:9; 27:13; 42:8 and 42:8 again. The occurrences in Job 1 and 2 and 42 do not concern us, the poetic system of accentuation not being employed there. In 27:9 it precedes the name of God; in the other cases it serves to indicate the proper connection of words, thus facilitating the understanding of the passages.

3. After *Mercha-Mahpach* Pesiq occurs in Prov. 9:7, where it indicates the pregnant meaning of the participle.

4. After *Shalsheleth* Pesiq occurs in Prov. 6:10; 6:27; 24:33; and also in Job 5:19; 11:6; 15:23; 16:9; 32:6; 37:13. In Prov. 6:27 it seems to give distinctness and solemnity to the enunciation, standing between שׁוּן and שׁוּן; in Job 32:6 it indicates that the two words after which it stands belong together and express one idea. In the other instances Pesiq follows the word immediately after *Athnach* and indicates emphatic parallelism or the end of the clause.

5. After *Qadhma* Pesiq occurs in Prov. 1:27; 3:28; 5:21; 6:14; 6:22; 8:13; 8:30; 23:29; 24:12; 24:16; 24:27; 24:31; 25:13; 25:20; 27:10; 27:12; 27:14; 27:22; 28:10; 30:4; 30:4; 30:4; 30:9; 30:15; 30:19; 31:4, and also in Job 3:26; 4:5; 5:5; 6:10; 6:20; 10:3; 10:17; 10:22; 11:6; 12:3; 12:4; 12:6; 14:5; 14:13; 15:28; 15:30; 16:9; 16:11; 16:12; 16:13; 19:27; 19:29; 21:17; 24:5; 24:12; 24:15; 24:17; 24:20; 24:24; 28:4; 31:34; 31:35; 31:40; 32:2; 32:11; 33:23; 33:26; 34:19; 34:29; 34:33; 36:16; 37:6; 37:12; 38:2; 39:25. Without classifying these cases under their respective headings the general statement suffices, that the end of clauses, emphatic oppositions and parallelisms and the proper subject of adverbial and conjunctive qualifications are pointed out by Pesiq in these passages. In Job 6:20 distinct enunciation of the final and initial letter is effected by it.

6. After *Mahpach* Pesiq is found in Prov. 1:9; 6:3; 7:12; 10:26; 16:10; 16:11; 19:10; 21:20; 21:29; 22:3; 22:29; 23:7; 24:14; 24:24; 25:1; 25:28; 26:1; 27:27; 28:24; 29:13; 30:1; 30:8; 30:14; 30:20, and in Job 3:13; 4:16; 4:19; 6:1; 6:21; 9:24; 13:14; 13:27; 14:19; 15:24; 16:4; 18:2; 19:3; 19:12; 20:20; 20:23; 20:29; 21:28; 24:13; 26:14; 27:13; 28:3; 28:28; 30:1; 31:2; 32:6; 33:15; 33:27; 34:10; 34:20; 36:28; 37:4; 37:21; 42:3. Here, too, we must be satisfied with learning in general, that the characteristics of Pesiq after Mahpach are the same in the books of Proverbs and Job as in the Psalms. Pesiq generally follows the initial word and indicates emphasis, or the proper subject of an adverbial or a conjunctive qualification or distinctness of reading, as in Job 24:13 and 31:2.

Now we may draw the inferences that flow from the stated facts. The first conclusion has been stated in the beginning of this paper in the three canons concerning the use of Pesiq in the Psalms. This inference is so clear that it needs no further explanation.

The second inference has reference to the determination of the particular value of Pesiq in each special case. It may be worded thus: "After the greater conjunctive accents Pesiq effects emphasis or dignity of enunciation and may be compared to our exclamation point or our italics; after the less conjunctive accents Pesiq is generally equivalent to our comma or period, rarely to our exclamation mark." Greater conjunctive accents are those that serve usually immediately before the greater disjunctive accents, such as *Mercha* or *Munach* before *Silluq*, *Munach* before *Athnach*, *Yerach* before *Mercha-Mahpach*. Less conjunctive accents commonly serve before other conjunctive or the minor disjunctive accents. Hence the "less" is to be taken in an adjectival, not in an adverbial sense. The passages in which Pesiq follows *Shalshleth* immediately after *Athnach* are noted for the peculiarity, that the series of conjunctive accents in that member is always the same: *Shalshleth*, *Tiphcha*, *Munach*, *Silluq*. The only exception is in Ps. 89:3, where *Mercha* is found instead of *Munach*.

The third inference regards the converse forms of our three canons: "Wherever in the Psalms a possible misunderstanding of reading or singing has not been

impeded by a disjunctive accent, there Pesiq has been employed." This rule must be extended in due proportion to emphasis and solemnity of reading. And it is in great measure due to the variety of emphasis and intonation that the same piece is capable of, according to its different conceptions, that the use of Pesiq seems arbitrary and without fixed law. But let us not throw stones at the Massorites, before we ourselves explain the rules of our comma, semicolon and exclamation mark.

A fourth inference we may draw from the given facts: "The frequent use of Pesiq in the Psalms is in great measure due to the use of the poetic system of accentuation in the same." For in this system the number of conjunctive accents surpasses that of the disjunctive ones; hence an artificial and extensive means is needed to secure the right divisions and pauses. Other, secondary reasons for the frequent use of Pesiq in the Psalms are not excluded by this.

Finally, a word concerning the numerous instances in which Pesiq either precedes or follows the name of God. This name itself occurs in the Psalms much more frequently than in other portions of the Old Testament; besides, in most cases a specific reason different from the mere fact of the divine name preceding or following Pesiq, may be assigned for the occurrence of Pesiq. But granting all this, we cannot deny the general tendency of rendering the sacred name emphatic by the addition of Pesiq.

THE "Ἀπαξ Λεγόμενα OF THE MINOR PROPHETS.

BY REV. A. S. CARRIER,

McCormick Theol. Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

In the following pages I have presented words which are peculiar to but one of the Minor Prophets, and which are found nowhere else in the O. T. The LXX. translation follows each word, the Vulgate and Revised Version in the order named. No comments are added when the meaning of the word is obvious or the R. V. to be chosen, Montfaucon's edition of Origen's *Hexapla*, Paris, 1713, has been consulted, also *Vetus Testamentum, Græce*, Tischendorf-Nestle edition, Sexta, Leipzig, 1880.

The references in each case have followed the Hebrew arrangement of chapter and verse.

HOSEA.

- II. 4. וְנִאֲפִיפִי—τὴν μοιχείαν αὐτῆς—*adulteria sua*—her adulteries.
An intensive formation indicating the flagrancy of the sin, with a passive force. Cf. וְנִנֵּן in preceding clause.
- II. 13. נִבְלָתָהּ—τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν αὐτῆς—*stultitiam ejus*—her lewdness.
Keil understands the word to express the idea of "being faded" or "exhausted," which better agrees with the meaning in Qāl. Ges.¹⁰ takes the word in sense of *pudenda* and compares נָבַל in Pī'el "to disgrace."
- II. 14. אֶתְנָהּ cf. יִתְנֶה and הִתְנֶה VIII. 9.
- II. 15. וְחִלִּיתָהּ—καθόρμια αὐτῆς—*monili suo*—her jewels.
A segh. לִיָּהּ, fem. of חָלִי. The root meaning is "to be smooth," "polished."
- III. 2. לִתְךָ—νέβελ οἶνου—*dimidio coro*—half omer.
A measure, which Kimchi, according to Ges. Thes., says was חֲצִי חֶמֶר. Ges. Thes. and, after him apparently, Keil give for the LXX. rendering ἡμίκορος, but this is probably wrong for such a rendering does not appear in any edition of the LXX. I have been able to consult. Origen's *Hexapla* gives, however, for the rendering of several early Greek translations ἡμίκορον, while Theod. reads νέβελ οἶνου, a bottle of wine, and Sym. ἀσκοῦ οἶνου.
- V. 2. שְׁחָטָהּ—τὴν θήραν—*victimam*—in making slaughter (*mar.* in corruption).
Ges. Thes. takes this as a Pī. inf. est. from שָׁחַט "act in an abandoned manner," while Ges.¹⁰ treats it as a Pī'el noun, "shameful action," from a second שָׁחַט i. e. שָׁחַת. The LXX. have evidently mistaken the word. The

Vulg. treats it as a noun, in which case it is properly an *a. λ.* The R. V. seems to consider the word as an inf., the text Qāl, the mar. Pī.

- V. 2. שָׁטִים—ἀγρεύοντες—(*declinastis?*)—revolters.

This difficult passage the LXX. translate as follows: (verse 1 “a net stretched upon Itaburion) which the *hunters* [שָׁטִים] of prey [שְׁחָטָה] made fast.” The Vulgate either leaves the word out altogether or includes it in *declinastis*. “Deviation,” “wandering,” is the meaning given by Ges.¹⁰ Del. (Ps. ci. 3) and Keil take the word to be an equivalent of שָׁטִים, the latter derives it from שָׁטָה and translates “transgression.” The R. V. treats it as a Qāl act. part., from שוּט (cf. Ps. xc. 5).

- V. 13. יִנְהֶה—διαπαύσῃ—*solvere poterit*—he shall cure.

Ges. Thes. gives the meaning as “remove,” “drive away,” though the corresponding Syr. word means “flee.” The parallelism indicates clearly that it is a syn. of רָפָא. In Prov. xvii. 22 we find the *a. λ.* נָהָה “healing.”

- VI. 10. Q’rī שְׁעִרְרִיָּה K’th. שְׁעִרְרִיָּה—φρικώδη—*horrendum*—a horrible thing. שְׁעִרְרָה occurs in Jer. xviii. 13. A passive formation like נִאֲפֹפִיָּה, the 3d rad. doubled in each case on account of the guttural. The root is שָׁעַר* “shudder” (Ges.¹⁰).

- VII. 5. אֶת-לִצְצִים—μετὰ λοιμῶν—*cum illisoriis*—with scorners.

The LXX. word means “with pestilence.” Ges. Thes. inclines to take this from לוֹץ in the Pol. for מְלִצְצִים.

- VII. 16. זֶה—οὗτος—*ista*—this.

A dialectical variation for זֶה.

- VIII. 6. שִׁבְבִים—πλανῶν—in *araneorum telas*—be broken in pieces.

Origen’s Hex. shows several variants: Sym., ἀκατασταῶν (“unsteady”); Theod. the same as LXX.; 5th ed., ῥεμβεύων; and the reading of some others is, with the Vulg., “like the web of a spider,” taking the word from the first שִׁבֵּב which means “weave.” A second שִׁבֵּב has the idea of “divide,” which of course is the meaning best suited to this passage.

- VIII. 9. הִתְנוּ—δῶρα (ἡγάπησαν)—*munera dederunt*—hire.

הִתְנוּ—παραδοθήσονται—*cum mercede conduxerint*—hire.

- II. 14. אֶתְנָה—μισθώματα—*mercedes*—hire.

The root meaning is “to stretch out,” hence “to offer,” and it is nearly syn. with נתַן. The Vulg. agrees with the fifth edition found in Origen’s Hex. The LXX. translation “shall be delivered” in v. 10 implies a Hophal form.

- VIII. 13. הִבְחֵבִי—*offerent*—mine offerings.

Ges.¹⁰ seems to prefer another meaning which comes from the Aram. הִבְחֵב “to bake,” and suggests that this may be a North Palestinian expression, especially chosen, for “burnt offering.” The Greek translators have found the word difficult. The LXX. appear to leave it out altogether, translating

the passage διότι ἐὰν θύσωσι θυσίαν; Aq., φέρε, φέρε; Sym., ἐπαλλήλοις; Theod., μεταφορῶν. There seems no reason to depart from Kimchi's interpretation **מִתְּנוּת** "gifts."

IX. 7, 8. **מִשְׂטֵמָה**—μανία σου—*amentiae insania*—enmity.

The root is **שָׂטַם**, perhaps the same as **שָׂטַן**. Ges. Thes. would translate "destruction," but "enmity" seems, on the whole, nearer the ground-meaning.

IX. 8. **יִקְוֶשׁ**—σκολιά—*ruinae*—fowlers.

יִקְוֶשׁ occurs three times (Ps. xci. 3; Prov. vi. 5; Jer. v. 26) in the sense of "fowler." **יִקְוֶשׁ** is probably only a dialectical variation.

IX. 12. **בִּשְׁוֹרִי**—σάρξ μου—*cum recessero*—when I depart from.

Aq. translates ἐκκλιναντός μου. The word is a dialectical variation for **סוּר**.

IX. 14. **צִמְקִים**—ξηρούς—*arentia*—dry.

Qāl act. part. from **צִמַּק**. The root **צִם** occurs in a number of words, signifying "that which is of close texture," "hard," hence "dry."

X. 6. **בִּשְׁנָה**—ἐν δόματι (in (with) a gift)—*confusio*—shame.

A fem. u-class Segh. from **בִּישׁ**.

X. 9. **בְּנֵי עֲוִלָּה**—τὰ τέκνα ἀδικίας—*filios iniquitatis*—children of iniquity.

Another form of **עֲוִלָּה**.

XIII. 1. **רָתַת**—δικαιώματα—*horror*—trembling.

Aq. φρίκην. Keil refers to **רָטַת** Jer. XLIX. 24.

XIII. 8. **סִגּוֹר**—συγκλεισμέν—*interiora*—caul.

Job xxviii. 15 has this same word, which the LXX. translate συγκλεισμέν; Vulg., *aurum*; R. V., gold. There the word has a passive sense, "that which is shut up," while ours has an active, "the enclosure."

XIII. 5. **תִּלְאָבוֹת**—ἀοικητώ—*solitudinis*—great drought.

From **לָאֵב*** related to **לָהֵב*** whence **לָהֵב** "flame."

XIII. 10, 14. **אֵהִי**—ποῦ—(10) *ubi* (14) *ero*—where?

Verse 14 Aq. and Quinta, ποῦ; Sym., ἐσομαι.

Keil suggests that this is merely a dialectical variation for **אֵהִי**.

XIII. 14. **קָטַבְךָ**—κέντρον σου—*morsus tuus*—destruction.

Syn. with **קָטַבְךָ** (Ps. xci. 6). The Text. Recep. of the N. T. transposes this word in 1 Cor. xv. 55, placing it in the first clause. The critical editions retain the Hebrew and LXX. order.*

XIII. 14. **נַחֵם**—παράκλησις—*consolatio*—repentance.

* It is curious to note that the LXX. translate **דְּבַרְךָ** in this verse, by ἡ δίκη σου (Aq. and Quinta οἱ λόγοι σου; Sym., correctly, πλεγμα σου), while in 1 Cor. xv. 55 we read τὸ νίκος for ἡ νίκη. In quoting from memory may not the apostle have unconsciously substituted νίκη for δίκη, under the influence of the idea of the preceding quotation from Isaiah, and then to avoid using a new word, have changed the form to τὸ νίκος?

"Repentance" is the meaning best suited to the context, and is given by Ges. Thes. and Ges.¹⁰

XIII. 15. יִפְרִיא—διαστελεῖ—*dividet*—though he be fruitful.

Keil explains the irregular writing of the word by its being a play upon the word אִפְרִים. The root meaning of the word is "to break forth;" hence the translators have given, in two of the cases before us, the meaning "divide." This is but one of the frequent interchanges of ל'ה and ל'א forms.

XIV. 1. וְהָרִיתִי—καὶ αἱ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσιν—*foetae ejus*—their women with child.

JOEL.

I. 8. אֲלִי—θρήνησον—*plange*—lament.

Cognate with לָל, אָלל.

I. 7. לִקְצֹפָה—εἰς συγκαλασμός—*decorticavit*—and barked (*mar.* broken).

קָצַף gives us the idea of "breaking," "tearing," and hence the rendering of the margin seems to be the better.

I. 17. עָבְשׁוּ—ἐσκήρτησαν—*computruerunt*—rot (*mar.* shrivel).

Keil gives two contradictory explanations, "to moulder away" and "dry up." The idea of "thickening," "hardening," seems to inhere in the root. The Arabic word "to shrivel," contains the same radicals; there is a close similarity to יָבֵשׁ; and the context favors "loss of vitality by extreme drought," rather than by "decay."

— פָּרָדוֹת—δαμάλεις—*fumenta*—seeds.

The LXX. and Vulg. evidently read פָּרָדוֹת hence the translation "heifers." Henderson (Min. Proph.) supports the translation "seeds," by reference to the N. T. where the Syriac word ܦܪܕܐ is found in several places meaning "seed." The word is derived from פָּרַד "separate," referring to the scattering of the seed.

— מִגְרַפְתֵּיהֶם—ἐπὶ ταῖς φάτναις αὐτῶν—*in stercore suo*—under their clods.

The root is נָרַף "to draw." From this root comes אֲנָרוֹף "fist," (Ex. xxi. 18; Isa. lviii. 4) "that which is drawn together." It seems preferable to give our word a like force rather than to take it, as Keil does, in the meaning of a "detached piece of earth," "fragment."

— מִמְּגָרוֹת—ἀποθήκαι—*apothecae*—barns.

The parallelism indicates clearly the meaning of this word. A noun formed with מ denoting place, from the subst. מְגֹרָה.

II. 20. הַצִּפְנִי—τὸν ἀπὸ βορρᾶ—*eum, qui ab Aquilone est*—the northern army.

— צַחְחָנוֹ—ὁ βρόμος αὐτοῦ—*putredo*—ill savor.

IV. 10. הַחֲלִישׁ—ὁ ἀδύνατος—*infirmus*—the weak.

IV. 11. עֲוִשׁוּ—συναθροίσεσθε—*erumpite*—haste ye (*mar.* assemble yourselves).

חִוֵּשׁ may be a related root. The text of the R. V. is to be preferred to the margin.

AMOS.

II. 13. תַּעִיק—*κλιεταί*—*stridet*—presseth.

— מַעִיק—*κυλίω*—*stridebo*—press.

Ges.¹⁰ gives "turn" as the ground-meaning, which justifies the LXX. The Vulg. uses a word which expresses the result of pressure on a cart, עָקָה (Ps. LV. 4) "pressing down," מוֹעָקָה (Ps. LXVI. 11) "burden" seem to establish the meaning "press."

III. 12. בָּרַל—*λοβόν*—*extremum*—a piece.

From the root בָּרַל, a Qāl formation. The only trace of the word in the simple stem.

— וּבִרְמִשָּׁן (עֵרֶשׁ)—*ἐν Δαμασκῶ*—*in Damasci grabato*—on the silken cushions. Henderson (Min. Proph.) renders "Damascus," and indeed the parallelism would seem almost to justify it, were it not that a reference to Damascus seems out of place in this connection. The pointing of this word is well attested and the meaning clear.

IV. 2. בִּצְנוֹת—*ἐν ὀπλοῖς*—*in contis*—with hooks.

In the sense of "hook," צָן is several times used in the O. T.

— דִּוְגָה (בְּסִירוֹת)—*εἰς λέβητας ὑποκαιομένους*—*in ollis ferventibus*—with fish-hooks.

סִיר has been translated "pot" by the Vulg.; and דִּוְגָה curiously, "boiling," undoubtedly influenced by the meaning taken for סִיר, but the word is plainly an abstract noun meaning "fishery."

IV. 3. הֶרְמוֹנָה—*εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Ῥομάν*—*in Armon*—into Harmon.

The translators give each a different rendering to this word. Aq., *εἰς Ἀρμανὰ ὄρος*; Sym., *εἰς Ἑμηνίαν*; Theod., *εἰς ὑψηλὸν ὄρος*; Quinta, *Μονά*. There seems to be a strong probability that the word is simply another form of אֶרְמוֹן "palace," so Henderson, or "citadel." The versions, though differing in some respects, point to the high antiquity at least of our Masoretic text. They seem all to have had the same form before them, and to have felt the same difficulties as modern translators.

IV. 13. שִׁחוֹ—*τὸν χρῖστὸν αὐτοῦ*—*eloquium suum*—his thought.

The LXX. combines the two words מֶה-שִׁחוֹ reading מִשְׁחוֹ "his anointed."

V. 11. בּוֹשְׁסֵכֶם—*κατεκονδύλιζον*—*diripiēbatis*—ye trample upon.

Probably a dialectical variation for בּוֹסֵם from בּוֹס.

V. 16. הֵן—*οἶαί*—*vae*—alas.

V. 20. אָפֵל—*γνόφος*—*caligo*—very dark.

Cf. אֶפְלָה Ex. x. 22.

V. 26. סִבְכוֹת—*τὴν σκηνήν*—*tabernaculum*—Sikkuth (*mar. tabernacle*).

— כִּיּוֹן—*Ῥαφαί*—*imaginem*—Chiun (*mar. shrine*) Syr. ܟܝܘܢ.

For the first word Aq. has *συσκιασμούς*; Sym., *τὴν σκηνήν*; one version (marked ἄλλος in the edition of the Hex. used) *εἰκόνας*.

For the second, Aq. and Sym. simply transliterate *χιούν*. The whole passage in the LXX. reads: *καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολδχ, καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν* 'Ραιφάν, τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν οὗς ἐποίησατε ἑαυτοῖς.* Theod. reads: *καὶ ἤρατε τὴν ὄρασιν τοῦ βασιλέως ὑμῶν, ἀμάρωσιν εἰδώλων ὑμῶν, ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν*. The LXX. evidently misplaced and misread כיון, taking כ for ר which is similar to it in the old Hebrew characters. Henderson seems to prove conclusively that there was a planet named *Kivan*, which was referred to in this place. The Syr. transliteration ܕܝܐܢ shows how early our word was identified with the name of this planet.

VI. 5. הפְּרָטִים—*οἱ ἐπικρατοῦντες—qui canitis—that sing idle songs.*

Cf. פָּרַט Lev. xix. 10 "scatterings." ' Henderson makes the word a syn. of נָצַח on the authority of the LXX.

VI. 8. מְתַאֵב—*βδελύσσομαι—detestor—abhor.*

Probably for מְתַעֵב.

VI. 10. וּמִסְרָפוֹ—*καὶ παραβιώνται—et comburet eum—even he that burneth him.*

A dialectical variation for מִשְׂרָפוֹ.

VII. 1. הַלְקִישׁ—*ἐωθενή—serotini—latter growth.*

לִקְשׁ—*βροῦχος—(a wingless locust)—serotinus—latter growth.*

Cf. מִלְקוּשׁ Jo. ii. 3.

The LXX. may have read יִלֵּק in the second case. They have misunderstood the whole clause in a very curious way.

VII. 7, 8. אֶנְךָ—*ἀδαμαντίνον, ἀδάμας—litem, trulla (i. e. trowel) cementarii—plumb-line.*

Literally "lead." Aq. renders γάνωσις, "plastering" or "polishing."

VII. 14. בֹּקֶר—*αἰπόλος—armentarius—herdman.*

A denominative like כֹּרֶם.

— וּבֹלֵם—*κνίζων—vellicans—dresser.*

Aq., *ἐρευνῶν*; Sym., *ἐχων*; Theod., *χαρακῶν* ("hedging") given by Ges.¹⁰ (and Keil) as a denom. from the Arab. word for "fig." The versions, though varying, all express practically the same sense.

VIII. 8. כְּאֵר—*ὡς ποταμός—quasi fluvius—like the River.*

IX. 9. בִּכְבֵּרָה—*ἐν τῷ λικμῷ—in cribro—in a sieve.*

Aq. and Sym. κοσκίνα ("sieve").

From כָּבַר in the meaning "weave."

IX. 11. וְחִרְסָתָיו—*καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα—ea quae corruerant—his ruins.*

Root חָרַס "to tear apart."

* Stephen follows this closely (Acts vii. 43) inserting *προσκυνεῖν* after *ἐποίησατε* and substituting *αὐτοῖς* for *ἑαυτοῖς*. But the critical editions of the N. T. vary in the proper name, reading 'Ρεμφάν, 'Ρεφάν, and 'Ρομφάν.

THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION.

BY PROFESSOR W. HENRY GREEN,

Princeton Theological Seminary.

I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

In his introductory statement of the points agreed upon by the writers in the present discussion, as he apprehends them, my friend Prof. Harper has to some extent misconceived my attitude to the question before us, which I prefer to state in my own words.*

If the critics were content with attempting a partition of Genesis (or even of the so-called Hexateuch) on purely literary grounds and with drawing what might fairly be reckoned legitimate inferences from such a partition, this would be a matter of curious interest but nothing more. The serious aspect of the affair is that there are presuppositions involved in the arguments employed and there are deductions made which are prejudicial to or subversive of the credibility and inspired authority of the sacred record. This constitutes the gravity of the case, so far as my view of it is concerned and so far as it affects the great body of those who reverence the Scriptures as the word of God. I am accordingly only concerned to show, first, that the partition proposed by the critics in itself and apart from unfriendly prepossessions warrants no such destructive conclusions; secondly, that many of the arguments urged in support of the current critical partition are clearly invalid.

A clear discrimination is to be made in the first place between the partition of the text itself, for which the critics contend, and the inferences professedly deduced from that partition. It is possible to accept the former and yet to retain

* I do not object to the statement of the question at issue, HEBRAICA, p. 18, 6 (3), "*Are there really distinct documents ? i. e. such as the analysis of critics of the present generation presents ?*" provided it is not limited to the words in italics, but embraces the succeeding explanatory clause as well. It is the *current scheme* of Pentateuch division, adopted alike by critics so widely at variance in other respects as Wellhausen and Kuenen on the one hand and Dillmann and Kittel on the other, which is under discussion. This carries with it not simply the recognition of certain lines of partition, but a series of consequences uniformly regarded by its advocates as flowing from it, impugning the truth and the consistency of the sacred volume. The mutual relations of these supposed documents are accordingly of vital consequence and must necessarily be considered. That Prof. Harper and myself are really at one upon the point to be discussed is evident from the fullness with which he has set forth not merely the analysis, but its commonly accepted consequences.

the right to judge of the legitimacy of the latter. We find in Genesis a continuous, connected and self-consistent narrative, which has all the appearance of a true and veritable history, and, so far as it can now be traced, has always been so regarded by the people among whom it originated; and there appears to be no good reason for discrediting it. The mythical character attaching to the early record of pagan nations is not to be imputed to the biblical account of the primeval age of the world or of the origin of the Israelitish people. For the narrative of the Bible is absolutely unique. It stands alone among all the records of antiquity in preserving in its primitive purity the true knowledge of God, in its freedom from grotesque, mythological conceits, and in presenting a truly rational account and one which is strikingly confirmed in its main outlines at least, if not in all its details, by modern scientific research as no similar document of antiquity can pretend to be, in relation to the origin of the world, the unity of the human race, the primeval history of mankind and the filiation of nations. And as the preliminary stage in a grand scheme of divine revelation continued through succeeding ages, whose reality and supernatural character are attested by the most convincing proofs, it has a well-founded claim to be regarded as transmitting a faithful account of God's dealings with men from the beginning.

And there is an additional guarantee of the truth of Genesis in its Mosaic origin, which in spite of all critical clamor, in spite even of the concessions of eminent evangelical scholars, cannot be set aside. The laws from Exodus to Deuteronomy are, by their own positive claim, by ineffaceable internal indications and by both the express attestation and incidental historical confirmation of subsequent Scriptures, irrefragably Mosaic. And Genesis, which is clearly preliminary to the books that follow, must, as the critics themselves allow, have the same origin as they.

There is something clearly wrong in a critical process which can take a history that in itself is quite consistent and entirely credible, and sunder it into distinct documents which are mutually repugnant and irreconcilable. A purely literary analysis on grounds of diction, style and modes of thought, whatever it might reveal respecting the structure and formation of the book, obviously cannot impair the truth of that which is otherwise credible, or the consistency of that which in itself is harmonious. And in fact the damaging consequences attributed to the critical hypothesis result in great part from inferences resting not on positive data but on the critics. The fundamental vice in the whole process is that they quietly assume what they undertake to demonstrate.

We have the book of Genesis in its present form. According to the current critical hypothesis it was put together by a redactor from pre-existing documents. The portions extracted from each of these documents severally can, it is claimed, be recognized and assigned to the source from which they came. By combining paragraphs of kindred origin the primary documents can again be reproduced in

their distinct and separate state to that extent to which the redactor made use of them in his compilation. It is confessed, however, that no one of them can be restored in its completeness. There are evident breaks in their continuity. There are in each allusions unexplained in any existing paragraph of that particular document. Just how much has been dropped, or what was in the missing portions, cannot of course be known. This being the case, the allegation that a given passage had a meaning in the document from which it was taken, different from that which it obviously has in its present connection and especially a meaning at variance with the connection in which it now stands, is pure assumption on the part of the critic, for which in the nature of the case he can have no adequate justification. He has by his own admission the document in an imperfect state, with no means of filling acknowledged chasms or estimating the amount or the character of what has been omitted, and yet he presumes to challenge the work of the redactor, who by the hypothesis had the documents before him in their original completeness, and to convict him of incapacity or dishonesty. There can be no possible warrant for such a procedure, unless the terms of the paragraph in question are themselves in evident conflict with its existing context. That they are capable of a different interpretation and might be so explained in some other connection is nothing to the purpose. Many passages rent from their connection might have an entirely different meaning put upon them from that which they were intended to have.

So when it is affirmed that two or more paragraphs, which, as they now stand, describe distinct subjects or events, are nevertheless but variant accounts of the very same thing. Without the materials for the formation of a correct judgment it is arbitrarily assumed that the record in its present form is false, and that the redactor has either from ignorance or design combined his sources in a way that misrepresents their real meaning.

So too when a discrepancy is inferred from the silence of one document respecting matters set forth in another. How utterly gratuitous and arbitrary such inferences are, appears from the repeated instances in which from like premises precisely the opposite conclusion is drawn, the exigencies of the critical hypothesis itself compelling its advocates to assume that the redactor found the same thing recorded in two or more of the documents, but deemed it sufficient to extract a single account from one of them and hence passed the others by.

So also when the credibility of Genesis is undermined by alleging that the primary documents out of which it was compiled, were first committed to writing many centuries after the Mosaic age, this conclusion is notoriously and avowedly based on grounds which presuppose their unhistorical character and convert them into fluctuating myths and legends and assume likewise that all the rest of the sacred history has been tampered with and deliberately falsified.

And so in general it will be found that deductions from the critical hypothesis impugning the veracity of Genesis find no real warrant in the analysis itself, but rest upon conjectures and assumptions of the critics. They assume that the record is unreliable and untrustworthy; and every suspicion which their fertile fancy can suggest, however baseless, is accepted as a fresh proof that no dependence can be placed on its statements. It is no marvel if under such treatment its historical character is frittered away completely.

The critical partition of Genesis has been gradually elaborated during more than a century by a succession of scholars of the greatest eminence, who have expended upon it an immense amount of learning, ingenuity and patient toil, until they have at length brought it into a shape in which it is accepted with substantial unanimity by European critics of widely different schools of thought and every various grade of belief and unbelief. This is of course a very significant fact and is entitled to its full weight in the consideration of this subject. That cannot be lightly dismissed which has gained the approval of so many minds. Nevertheless it is not the weight of authority, but the force of the arguments, which is decisive. And the fluctuations of critical opinion in the past, and particularly the rapid and extensive changes which have taken place in the most recent times, caution us not to regard its present state as one of permanent equilibrium.

Some obvious grounds of doubt and hesitation offer themselves at the outset of a general nature which may be noted here.

1. The very ingenuity of the hypothesis and the perfection to which it has been brought, awaken the suspicion that its inventors may have been imposed upon by their own dexterity. In its present form it is a kind of universal solvent. With P, and J, and E, and the added resources of the old fragmentary hypothesis in the shape of P¹, P², etc., J¹, J², etc., on the one hand, and minute divisibility on the other, and R ever ready for any emergency in the way of transposition, modification, excision, insertion and readjustment *ad libitum*, and a latitude of conjecture which has no check but the pleasure of the operator, it seems versatile and pliant enough to be equal to anything. There is no mountain of difficulty over which it cannot work its way. There are no phenomena so adverse that it cannot be harmonized with them. It can either shape itself to accord with the facts, or can shape the facts to suit its own requirements. An argument that can prove everything, proves nothing, and one cannot escape the apprehension in the presence of a hypothesis of such universal adaptability that we may be dealing with a subjective creation rather than an objective reality, with skillfully constructed fancies instead of the actual state of the case.

2. This apprehension is increased by the rather impalpable nature of the subject dealt with and the precarious nature of the arguments employed. The wanderer in a trackless wilderness, with no compass and no fixed object to direct

his course, will almost inevitably diverge from a straight line, and may imperceptibly swerve more and more until at length he is moving in an opposite direction from that in which he started. So the very nature of the case renders it well nigh impossible that accurate results should be continuously reached in the manner attempted by the critics. The comparison of certain passages supposed to belong respectively to distinct writers, furnish various criteria of diction, style and sentiment. These criteria direct the division of new passages, which in turn supply additional criteria. And so the work proceeds step by step, each result attained being assumed as the basis of a fresh advance, the accuracy of which is conditioned by the exactness of every previous portion of the process. The liability to error in dealing with so many unknown quantities is very great from first to last; and there is no external standard by which to test the correctness of the results or to ascertain and remove the errors that have been made. And yet a slight deviation at the outset or anywhere along the line, which it might be impossible either to avoid or to detect, would vitiate all subsequent conclusions.

3. This liability to error is seriously increased by the critics' undertaking to deal with such minute quantities. In order to carry the hypothesis through it becomes necessary to sunder individual sentences, clauses and even words from their connection and assign them to authors distinct from the assumed writers of the surrounding context. This is not only precarious in itself, but gives rise to the suspicion that the critical division is regulated by foregone conclusions rather than by a fair consideration of the actual phenomena; and that this mode of manipulation is only a device for getting rid of what is really adverse to the hypothesis.

4. Connected with what has been said is the obvious danger that the critical arguments may prove to be but reasoning in a circle. The text is partitioned agreeably to a given hypothesis; every passage having certain characteristics is assigned to one writer and such as have certain other characteristics to other writers. And when the partition is complete it corresponds with the hypothesis, simply because it was made by the hypothesis.

It is freely conceded that certain phenomena, particularly in the earlier chapters of Genesis, seem to be best explained by the supposition that it was based in whole or in part upon pre-existing written sources. Before the publication of Astruc's "Conjectures," the Dutch theologian and commentator, Vitranga, expressed the belief that "various writings of their fathers were preserved among the Israelites, which Moses collected, digested, embellished, and supplemented." Such an assumption in itself considered, so far from invalidating the record, tends rather to give it additional confirmation, since it increases the number of witnesses and to a certain extent replaces oral tradition by documentary evidence. And it does not in any way affect the question whether the book in its present form is to be ascribed to Moses.

With these prefatory remarks my own attitude to the question under discussion may be briefly stated as follows :

1. The critical analysis of Genesis, so far as it is a purely literary inquiry and apart from the destructive consequences uniformly deduced from it by those who advocate and accept it, may be considered an open question to be determined by literary evidence.

2. The supplementary hypothesis is pressed with fewer difficulties than the documentary hypothesis now in vogue.*

3. The methods and arguments by which the partition is effected are to so large an extent unsound and the conclusions drawn from them so insecure, that it is exceedingly doubtful whether any safe and satisfactory division in detail is practicable or any approach can be made in this way towards a reconstruction of the presumed original sources.

Prof. Harper divides the passage under review, Gen. 1:1-12:5, into four sections and states the views and arguments of the critics in respect to each of them severally. These sections are now to be examined *seriatim*, and in each of them inquiry will be made into

1. The alleged contradictions and discrepancies which are held to establish the existence of two independent narratives; and it will be found that even though the critical partition were allowed, no such discrepancies exist.

2. The validity of the arguments by which the critical partition is defended.

* One insuperable difficulty, as it seems to me, in the ordinary documentary hypothesis is its fundamental assumption that P and J constitute two distinct and independent documents prepared with no reference to each other. It is inconceivable that two separate treatises, written by different authors, neither of whom had any knowledge of the work of the other, could proceed so completely upon the same line in plan and contents. Prof. Harper is at pains (p. 66) to indicate the affinity of P and J in Gen. 1-12:9; he gives a summary of this section of the book under nine heads, each of which is treated in both documents and in the same order. So closely allied are they in fact that R has been able to produce a continuous, regularly unfolding history by piecing together alternate sections from one and the other. The critics may be safely defied to adduce a similar instance in all literature. Such a measure of correspondence cannot have arisen without design: and paragraphs borrowed from independent and unrelated sources cannot be so dovetailed together as to produce the impression of harmonious unity and uninterrupted connection. It was the embarrassment arising from this consideration which led to the substitution of the supplementary for the documentary hypothesis until the most recent school of critics found it necessary to fall back upon the latter, because the former could not be made to harmonize with their revolutionary ideas. If J did not write independently, but simply supplemented P, making additions to a pre-existing document for the sake of incorporating fresh material, the relationship of the parts both in general plan and in numerous minute particulars is more easily accounted for. Principal Cave (*Inspiration of the Old Testament*, p. 208) has recently and as I suppose independently offered the suggestion, first made, so far as I am informed, by Rev. Dr. Schaff, that J was Moses; beside which may be placed the conclusion of Delitzsch based on independent grounds that the "Jehovistic-Deuteronomic" style is the best representative of the primitive Mosaic type (*Neuer Commentar über die Genesis*, p. 20). Who knows whether the higher criticism itself may not yet lead up to the old traditional view of Moses' authorship?

II. SECTION 1.—GEN. 1-3.

It is alleged, p. 20,* that these chapters "contain two distinct accounts of creation" which differ so seriously in their "material," p. 27, in several respects, as to be incapable of being harmonized by any fair method of interpretation. Neither of these statements is correct. Ch. 2:4b-3:24, which is assigned to J, does not contain a second account of the creation additional to that of P 1:1-2:3. There is no lack of agreement between these two passages.

These points must be examined separately.

1. No Duplicate Account of the Creation.

1) That ch. 2:4 sqq. is not to be so understood in the intention of the writer is plain from the manner in which it is introduced. It is professedly not an account of the creation, but a sequel to that account. Ch. 2:4a, which is the title of the section that follows, announces as its theme "the generations of the heaven and of the earth, when they were created." This is the first of a series of similar titles to the several sections into which the Book of Genesis is divided. The history is parceled into "the generations of Adam," 5:1; "the generations of Noah," 6:9; "the generations of the sons of Noah," 10:1; "the generations of Shem," 11:10; "the generations of Terah," 11:27, etc., etc., to indicate its genealogical character. The proper frame-work of the history is the line of descent traced regularly from Adam to Jacob and his posterity. This line of descent is arrested from time to time in order to introduce such facts as are to be related, and then proceeds again from the point at which it had arrived. Divergent lines are traced, as occasion arises, to a sufficient distance, and are then dropped, the writer then uniformly reverting to the main line of descent, that of the chosen race, which is his principal theme.

The "generations" of Adam, Noah, etc., mean, as is required by the form of the Hebrew word (תולדות), its uniform usage and the contents of the sections so entitled, not the origin or ancestry of Adam, Noah, etc., but their descendants. Accordingly, when for the sake of a more precise correspondence with the titles that are to follow, this term properly belonging to the sphere of human relations is transferred to the material universe in the first title of the series (compare an analogous transfer for a like reason in Luke 3:38), "the generations of the heaven and the earth" must denote not their origin, how they were created or brought into being, but, so to speak, their progeny, that which sprang from them, man the child of heaven and earth, not in any mythical sense, but in the plain and obvious sense of the narrative, his body formed from the dust of the ground, his spirit breathed into him by God himself. It is not an account of the creation of the world that is here announced, but of the formation of man and the first stages of his history upon the earth.

* All references, not otherwise specified, are to the last number of HEBRAICA.

This evident conclusion is not to be evaded by any critical device. Some would attach 2:4a to the preceding section, 1:1-2:3, as the summary of its contents. But this is impossible for a variety of reasons.

1. It is in violation of the uniform analogy of the whole series of similar titles, which invariably stand at the head, never at the close of the section which they describe.

2. This is confirmed by the identical structure of the immediately following clause here and in 5:1, where the connection is unquestioned. "In the day of Jehovah Elohim's making earth and heaven" follows the title "the generations of the heaven and of the earth" in precise conformity with "in the day of Elohim's creating Adam," after the title "the generations of Adam."

3. If 2:4a is a subscription to the preceding section, then 2:4b-4:26 is the only portion of the book without a title, while 1:1-2:3 will have two titles, one which is entirely appropriate at the beginning, 1:1, and one which is altogether unsuitable at the end.

4. On the divisive hypothesis the additional incongruity results, that when the section ascribed to J (2:4b-ch. 4) is excluded and the connection restored as it originally existed in P, 2:4a will be immediately followed by 5:1, and thus two titles will have stood in direct juxtaposition.

5. As the titles now stand they succeed each other in a perfectly natural order. (1) The creation of heaven and earth in the beginning; (2) the generations of heaven and earth, Adam and his family, the child of both worlds; (3) the generations of Adam traced to Noah and his family; (4) the generations of Noah, and so on.

6. "The generations of the heaven and of the earth" in its proper Hebrew sense does not correspond and cannot by any possibility be made to correspond with the contents of ch. 1, which records the creation of the world instead of giving an account of a being sprung from the world. Dillmann indeed explains it of organized and living things produced upon the earth in the onward progress of creation. But כְּהִנְיָאם need not mean "while they were in the course of creation;" Hupfeld shows (*Quellen der Genesis*, pp. 110, 111) that it may as well mean "after they were created," Isa. 6:13; 30:14; 53:9. Even in the sense given to it by Dillmann, however, it would not be applicable to the whole, but only to a part of ch. 1. The firmament and the heavenly bodies, the seas and dry land are identical with the heavens and the earth, not their offspring. The creating and shaping the material universe cannot with propriety be included under the "generations" of the heavens and of the earth, and the writer of the chapter could never have expressed its purport in such terms. And even the vegetable and animal products, which by creative fiat were made to issue from the earth, were wholly of an earthly, not a heavenly, mold. It is not until v. 26 that the creation of man is reached. To the great body of the chapter its alleged subscription is

manifestly inappropriate, and man himself in ch. 1 is considered simply in his place in the general scheme of created things. He is introduced into the world; but there is no record of what befell him or his family, such as we are authorized to expect, such as is in fact given in 2:4b-4:26. Every similar title in Genesis is followed either by a history of the immediate offspring or by successive generations of descendants.

The inappropriateness of 2:4a as a title to ch. 1, which has just been exhibited, is equally valid against the critical suggestion, affirmed (p. 19) without proof or explanation, as though it were the most natural thing in the world, that it originally stood before 1:1 or in its place, but was removed to its present position by the Redactor. No writer, who understood the meaning of its terms, could ever have placed it there. Certainly not the writer who uses it so appropriately everywhere else in Genesis. Or if it was a suitable title for Gen. 1, what possible motive could a sensible Redactor have had for transposing it?

It follows from what has been said that, in the view of the author of 2:4a, and of the author of the Book of Genesis as at present constituted (whether these are the same or different persons), the section which the critics assign to J is not a repetition of that of P, but a sequel to it.

2) That this is really the relation of these two passages will further appear from an examination of their respective contents. Ch. 2 is not a second account of the creation which had already been described in ch. 1. The making of earth and heaven is not narrated but presupposed, 2:4b. No account is given of their formation. No mention is made of the sea and its occupants; none of the sun, moon and stars; none of covering the earth with its varied vegetation; but only of planting a garden in Eden and making its trees grow from the ground, vs. 8, 9. When banished from Eden man was to eat "the herb of the field," 3:18, whose existence is thus assumed, but whose production is only spoken of in ch. 1. These particulars could not be omitted from an account of the creation. To say (as Dill.) that they may originally have been contained in ch. 2, but were omitted by R because they were treated sufficiently in ch. 1, is to make an assumption without a particle of evidence, which amounts simply to a confession that ch. 2 is not what it would have been, if the writer had intended to give a narrative of the creation, and that its omissions are with definite reference to the contents of ch. 1.

3) Ch. 2 is evidently throughout preliminary to ch. 3, the narrative of the fall. In order to make this intelligible it was necessary to explain, 1) the two constituents of man's nature, already intimated in the title to the section, which must be known to comprehend the form of the sentence pronounced upon him that dust must return to dust, v. 7, cf. 3:19; 2) the locality, the garden of Eden with its tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, vs. 8-17; 3) the actors, Adam and Eve, and their relation to each other, vs. 18-25. These particulars could not have been incorporated in ch. 1 without marring its symmetry.

That deals with the creation of the world at large. Everything is on a universal scale. And to introduce a detailed description of the garden of Eden, with its arrangements and man's position in it, would be quite inappropriate. The plan and purpose of ch. 1 made it necessary to reserve this for the following section, and it is accordingly given in ch. 2.

2. No Discrepancies.

There is no inconsistency between ch. 2 and ch. 1, as the critics pretend. In order to reach the description of the garden of Eden, the writer reminds his readers in precise conformity with ch. 1 that when earth and heaven were first made the former contained nothing for the subsistence of man. There was neither bush nor herb to serve him for food, 2:5. The threefold classification of 1:11,12, grass, herb and tree, is not repeated here, for grass was the food of beasts and not to his purpose. Bush **שיח** is used rather than tree **עץ**, to make the negative stronger. There was not only no tree; there was not even a bush. Subsequently trees, 2:9, as well as herbs, 3:18, are named as the plants yielding food for human use.

The reason given for the absence of food-bearing plants is twofold; there was no rain to moisten the earth and no man to till the ground.* There is no variance here with ch. 1. The suggestion that if the land had just emerged from the water, rain would not be needed, leaves out of view that according to 1:9,10 the separation of the terrene and the aqueous elements was complete, and the earth was dry land, **יבשה**, before any plants appeared upon its surface. A well-watered garden with ever-flowing streams was to be the abode of man; and in anticipation of it, it was natural to refer to the need of rain. And there is no implication that man was made prior to the existence of vegetation, contrary to 1:12,27. For

1. Ch. 2 alleges nothing respecting the relative priority of man or plants. It does not deal with the general vegetation of the globe any further than to carry us back to a time when it did not exist. Of its actual production ch. 2 says nothing. Its positive statement is restricted to the trees of the garden of Eden, vs. 8,9. And we are nowhere informed that these were brought into being at the same time with "the herb of the field," 3:18, or "the grass," **דשא**. Nothing is said of the origin of grass and herbs or of trees outside of Eden except in ch. 1.

2. The existence of man is stated to be a condition of that of plants designed for human use, not as an antecedent but as a concomitant. His tillage is requisite, 2:5, not to their original production, but to their subsequent care and culti-

* My friend, Dr. C. M. Mead, in a casual conversation on this subject, suggested what, if my memory serves me, was also maintained by Ebrard in a little tract on *Natural Science and the Bible* issued several years since, that the last clause of 2:5 is not connected with that which immediately precedes. "There was no plant (for there had been no rain) and there was no man." The critical objection is thus set aside entirely in a very simple manner.

vation. Jehovah planted the garden and made the trees grow in it, and then set man to till it (עָבַד v. 15 as v. 5).

3. The order of statement is plainly not that of time but of association in thought (see Driver's Hebrew Tenses, §§ 75,76; my Hebrew Grammar, § 276. d.; Prof. Harper's Hebrew Syntax, § 24. 2). V. 7, man is formed; v. 8, the garden planted and man put in it; v. 9, trees are made to spring up there; v. 15, man is taken and put in it. We cannot suppose (as Dillmann admits) the writer's meaning to be that man was made before there was any place in which to put him, and that he was kept in suspense until the garden was planted; that he was then put there before the trees, that were to supply him with food, had sprung up; and that after the trees were in readiness he was put there a second time. It is easy to deduce the most preposterous consequences from a writer's words by imputing to them a sense which he never intended. In order to pave the way for an account of the primitive paradise, he had spoken of the earth as originally destitute of any plants on which man might subsist, the existence of such plants being conditioned on that of man himself, 2:5. This naturally leads him to speak first of the formation of man, v. 7, then of the garden, in which he was put, v. 8. A more particular description of the garden is then given, vs. 9-14, and the narrative is again resumed by repeating that man was placed there, v. 15.* As there was plainly no intention to note the strict chronological succession of events, it cannot in fairness be inferred from the order of the narrative that man was made prior to the trees and plants of Eden, much less that he preceded those of the world at large, of which nothing is here said.

Nor does ch. 2 contradict ch. 1 in respect to the order of the creation of man and of the lower animals. The allegation that it does rests upon the assumption that Waw Consecutive future necessarily implies a sequence in the order of time, which, as we have already seen, is not correct. The record is (v. 19), "And out of the ground Jehovah Elohim formed all the beasts of the field and all the fowls of heaven and brought them to Adam." According to Hebrew usage this need not mean that the birds and beasts were then first formed with the view of providing a suitable companion for Adam. And when the scope of the passage is duly considered it will be seen that this cannot be its meaning.

It is a significant fact that Dr. Delitzsch, who is an adherent of the document hypothesis and can be suspected of no bias against it, and who in all the former editions of his Commentary on Genesis found ch. 1 and ch. 2 at variance on this point, in the last edition, embodying his most matured views, affirms that there is no discrepancy whatever, that "*et formavit...et adduxit = et cum formasset*

* The critics' assumption that vs. 10-15 (p. 20) or vs. 8b,10-14 (Dill.) is an interpolation, inasmuch as the description of the garden is a departure from strict narrative, which is afterwards resumed, as well as Budde's notion that the tree of life is to be erased from v. 9 and elsewhere as not belonging to the narrative originally, deserve notice only as illustrating the perfectly arbitrary standard of genuineness which is set up.

adduxit," and that this is both "possible in point of style and consonant to the mode of writing in the Bible history." Dr. Dillmann admits that the tense here used might antedate what immediately precedes, but insists that v. 18, "I will make him an help meet for him," implies that the animals were now made as well as brought to Adam. But to suppose that the beasts and birds were made in execution of this divine purpose is not only a grotesque conception in itself, but involves the incongruity that the Lord's first attempts were failures. If there are critics who account this "the natural interpretation" (p. 31) it is in the face of the whole Israelitish conception of Jehovah, as expressed in J and everywhere else. The beasts were brought to Adam not as the companion intended for him, but "to see what he would call them," i. e. to let them make their impression on him and thus awaken in his mind a sense both of his need of companionship and of their unfitness for the purpose. When this had been accomplished, Eve was made. The animals are here regarded simply with a view to this end. If the writer were describing the creation of the inferior animals as such, he would speak of all the orders of living things, not neglecting reptiles and aquatic animals. The principal thought is the Lord's bringing the beasts and birds to Adam; his making them is only referred to as subsidiary to this, with no intention of affirming anything as to the time when they were made.

Dr. Driver (Heb. Tenses, p. 106) finds it "difficult to believe that in the midst of a continuous piece of narrative, such as Gen. 2:19," the Waw Consec. future can be used where a pluperfect would have been in place. It is a familiar fact that Hebrew construction frequently coördinates what in occidental languages would preferably or even necessarily be subordinated. Thus, Gen. 44:22, "the lad cannot leave his father and he will leave his father and he will die," meaning "if he leave his father, the latter will die." Now when the stress lies upon the second of two verbs connected by Waw Consec. future, the sequence in time may be altogether in the second or principal verb and not in that which is in thought subordinate to it. Thus vs. 7,8, "he formed man....and planted a garden....and placed man there" is equivalent to "placed man in the garden which he had planted." Ex. 4:31, "The people believed and heard....and worshiped," i. e. and having heard they worshiped; of course hearing preceded believing. Deut. 31:9, "And Moses wrote this law and delivered it," i. e. he delivered the law which he had written; the delivery of the law was subsequent to the address to Joshua, vs. 7,8, but not the writing of it. In accordance with these analogies* 2:19 may be

* Numerous other examples of a like construction might be adduced, e. g. Gen. 18:2, "and he saw three men....and he saw and ran," i. e. when he saw, he ran. Gen. 24:65, Rebekah spoke to the servant before alighting from the camel. Josh. 2:22,23, "And they abode till the pursuers returned, and the pursuers sought them....and the two men returned," i. e. after the pursuers had vainly sought them the men returned. 1 Sam. 15:17,18, the anointing antedates the previous clause, however it be read. 1 Sam. 28:4, Saul could not have postponed the gathering of his army until the Philistines were encamped in Shunem. 1 Kgs. 13:12,13, "And his sons saw....and

equivalent to "the Lord brought the beasts which he had formed." And this construction seems to be demanded by the following considerations: 1) Throughout the chapter the order of thought is regarded rather than that of time; 2) the limited form of statement does not suit a general creation of the lower animals, but is shaped by the particular end in view; 3) the utterly unbiblical notion of God involved makes it incredible and impossible that the beasts were made with the design expressed in v. 18. The alleged discrepancy accordingly vanishes entirely.

Thus far the way is perfectly clear. The alleged inconsistencies do not exist in the record, but are of the critics' own making. It is surprising that they do not see that in their eagerness to create discrepancies in evidence of a diversity of writers they are cutting away the ground beneath their own feet. Glaring discrepancies might consist with the fragmentary but not with the documentary hypothesis. The manner in which these documents are supposed to be woven together, demands a high degree of skill and intelligence in the Redactor; and to allege at the same time, p. 70, that he "did not have insight sufficient to enable him to see that he was all the time committing grave blunders" is self-contradictory. Arguments that prove too much are as fatal to a hypothesis as arguments that prove too little.

3. The Critical Partition.

We are now to enter a more perplexed and difficult region, where the criteria are of a less tangible and decisive character. I do not wish here to be regarded as the advocate of any particular view, but simply as a seeker after truth, ready to accept whatever shall approve itself as in accordance with the facts of the case. We shall endeavor to feel our way gradually along, inquiring what the facts are and then what is their proper interpretation. Many of the critical arguments are manifestly unsound and irrelevant. They require to be carefully sifted, if that which may be really significant is to be distinguished from that which is not. In evidence of separate authorship, p. 21, arguments are drawn from "the language, the style, the material and the theology." The material of this section has already been to some extent considered; we now proceed to the language.

1) THE LANGUAGE OF P.

Thirty words or expressions in 1:1-2:4 are alleged to be characteristic of P; but a slight examination is sufficient to show that they have not the weight which the critics attach to them

he said," i. e. his sons having seen.... he said. Isa. 37:5,6, "And they came to Isaiah" (they had already delivered their message to him, vs. 3,4) "and he said to them," i. e. they having come he said. Isa. 39:1, he heard before he sent; Dr. Driver suspects an error in the text because the form of expression differs from 2 Kgs. 20:12; but may it not be only another mode of saying the same thing? Jon. 2:4 (the Hebrew enumeration is adopted where this differs from the A. V.) goes back of v. 3, and is amplified in what follows, not reaching the point of time in v. 3 until v. 8. Zech. 7:2 goes back of v. 1, which is only reached again in v. 4. For examples of like construction with Waw Consec. preterite, see Ps. 7:15; Ezek. 17:15.

1. It is easy to produce such lists of any length, where they are plainly unmeaning. Any two opposite pages of a work by any author might be scrutinized, and the words and expressions in each which do not chance to occur in the other noted as characteristic of different writers and used as a basis for the division of the rest of the work, all paragraphs, sentences and clauses being assigned to one or to the other as they happen to correspond to the first or to the second of these pages. Knobel, besides giving full details of the peculiar style, conceptions and aims of the *Rechtsbuch* and *Kriegsbuch*, draws out a list on successive pages of about 100 words and expressions characteristic of each and not occurring in any other document of the Hexateuch, and yet no subsequent critic has accepted his analysis and no one believes that those imaginary sources ever existed. "What would be thought of an attempt to prove the *Ars Poetica* spurious, on the ground that the words *exlex*, *sesquipedalia*, *cotis*, *litura*, *quincunce* and the phrases *purpureus pannus*, *lucidus ordo*, *callida junctura*, *norma loquendi*, *in medias res*, *incredulus odi*, *sagax rerum*, *vivas voces*, *ore rotundo*, *decies repetita*, *laudator temporis acti*, the simile of the mountain and the mouse, and the proverbial saying *occupet extremum scabies*, occur nowhere else in the writings of Horace?"*

2. The thirty words in question are swept together as with a drag-net, without discrimination. Hapaxlegomena and words of rare occurrence, which of course give no indication of a writer's habitual diction, are joined with the rest. The frequency with which a word occurs in one document or the fact of its absence from another is mechanically noted, without regard to the question whether there was occasion to use it. The use of synonyms in different sections is urged, but no inquiry made whether this is explicable on other grounds than the varying habits of distinct writers. This apparent reliance upon bulk rather than weight, upon multiplying examples without showing that any of them are really pertinent, awakens the suspicion that this may be but a great heap of chaff with very little wheat.

3. The distribution of these words in the Pentateuch is very remarkable and significant. It is such as to show in a glance to any one who is without a theory to support, that whatever they may or may not prove, they certainly do not favor the document hypothesis. These words, in so far as they recur again in a P section of Genesis, do so only in the account of the flood, and are then found again in the Pentateuch, for the most part, only in the legislation. When they do appear elsewhere in Genesis it is never in a P but always in a J section. Their restriction in Genesis to the narratives of the creation and of the flood might be explained in one or other of two ways. It would seem natural to trace it to common features in the subjects treated; the deluge was in a sense the undoing of

* J. A. Alexander, *The Earlier Prophecies of Isaiah*, p. xxxi. The examples given of words peculiar to the *Ars Poetica* are of course merely specimens; if it were worth while, the number might be indefinitely increased.

the work of creation, and like expressions might appropriately be employed in describing them both. Or if with the critics, it be imputed to sameness in the choice of words by the common author of both, then upon their method of reasoning it must necessarily follow from the uniform exclusion of all these words from the remaining P sections of Genesis, that the accounts of the creation and of the flood are from a source quite distinct from the rest of the book. And when it is found that several of these same words recur again with considerable frequency in the legislation of the three middle books of the Pentateuch, it might perhaps be inferred that the author of that law (tradition calls him Moses) was in possession of a written history of the creation and deluge; and that in framing his own narrative of those events he adopted its expressions as far as he found it convenient to do so, and that he also borrowed its terms as he had occasion in formulating his laws. Whether there is sufficient warrant for such a conjecture is another matter. But it would at least harmonize with the facts as already stated, which is more than can be said of the ordinary form of the document hypothesis.

In the following classification of the words alleged as characteristic of P they are numbered as on p. 22, for the sake of readier reference. Of course those that occur only in this one passage, as well as those which are also found in passages assigned to J or E, should in fairness be stricken from the list. There is no propriety on any hypothesis in considering them peculiar to P.

a. Occurring nowhere in the Pentateuch but in Gen. 1:1-2:4.

(4) תָּהוּ (also Deut. 32:10 J); בָּהוּ (7) רָקִיעַ (9) רֶשֶׁא (also Deut. 32:2 J); (20) דְּמוּת (also Gen. 5:1,3 quoted from 1:26).

b. Nowhere else in Genesis.

(14) תְּנִינִם (in Pent. only Ex. 7:9,10,12 P; Deut. 32:33 J); (24) כִּבְשׁ.

c. In creation and flood.

(2) בָּרָא (Gen. 5:1,2 from 1:27; 6:7 J; Ex. 34:10 (R?); Num. 16:30); (5) תְּהוֹם (Gen. 49:25 J; Ex. 15:5,8 E; Deut. 33:13 E); (16) פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמָלְאוּ (16) פָּרָה וּרְבָה with or without other words of like meaning is found several times elsewhere in P); (17) חֵית הָאָרֶץ.

d. In creation and ritual law.

(1) יִרְאֵשִׁית (in J Gen. 10:10; 49:13; Ex. 34:26; in E Ex. 23:19; nowhere in Pent. but Gen. 1:1 with prep. בּ); (6) הִבְדִּיל (implies inner distinction and so not the equivalent of פָּרַד, which denotes merely outward separation and

is used by P Gen. 10:5,32; 13:11 as well as J); (8) מָקוֹה (11) מֵאֲרֵת (19) רִדָּה (in J Num. 24:19); (26) צָבָא (in J Gen. 21:32; 26:26; Num. 32:27; E Gen. 21:22); (28) מִלְאכָה (J Gen. 33:14; 39:11); (29) קָדֵשׁ (in JE Ex. 19:10,14,22,23; 20:8; Josh. 3:5).

e. In creation, flood and ritual law.

(10) מִיץ (13) שָׂרֵץ verb and noun; (15) הִרְמֵשֶׁת (J Gen. 7:8) רִמֵּשׁ noun only in creation and flood in Pent. (in J Gen. 7:23); (18) צֶלֶם (Gen. 5:3 from 1:27); (21) זָכַר (also in Gen. 17 and 34 connected with circumcision); (22) נִקְבָּה (23) וְנִקְבָּה (25) אָכַלָה (P also uses אָכַל noun Ex. 12:4; 16:16,18,21 and מֵאֵל Gen. 6:21 which verse plainly shows that it is not the equivalent of אָכַלָה and substituted for it by J and E); (27) שָׁבַת (J Ex. 5:5; 16:30; 34:21; Deut. 32:26; E Ex. 23:12).

The above list contains all the words pronounced characteristic of P except (3) אֱלֹהִים which is reserved for future consideration;

* As to the suggestion that J and E use בְּתוֹחָה instead of בְּרֵאשִׁית, it is to be said that they never have occasion to speak of the absolute beginning of all things, which is here referred to, they only need a phrase meaning *at first*. They both use רֵאשִׁית as well as תוֹחָה, and P would have done the same had there been occasion for it, just as both words are found in other O. T. writings, e. g. Ecclesiastes (7:8; 10:13) and Hosea (1:2; 9:10).

(12) *לֵאמֹר* in a "loose and general sense instead of *שׁוֹם* or *לֵאמֹר*," which is found as well in J Gen. 15:10; 18:8; 30:40; 39:4,8,20; 41:41, and in E, Gen. 40:3,13; 41:10,42,48; and (30) *לֵאמֹר*, which is so far from lending any support to the hypothesis, that it can only be classed as belonging to P, on the prior assumption of the truth of the hypothesis. It is assigned to P, not by reason of its environment, but notwithstanding the fact that it is here the title of a J section to which it is assumed that it has been transferred from a former imaginary position at the beginning of ch. 1, for which it is not suitable and where it

could never have stood. Again in 37:2 it introduces a section composed of alternate paragraphs of J and E, in which there is not a single sentence from P until 41:46, and then not another till 46:8. Still further, in 11:27 and 25:19 it is followed by long passages from J with scarcely anything from P. The natural inference of one who had no preconceived theory in the case, would be that these titles prefixed alike to J and to P sections were either suggestive of their common authorship or at least that they proceeded from him to whom Genesis owes its present form, be he author or compiler.

If the total absence of all these words from any P sections in Genesis except those of the creation and flood does not disprove unity of authorship, how does an absence not quite so absolute from J sections indicate diversity of authorship? Or what cogency is there in a method of argument which does not work both ways, which is held to be conclusive whenever it makes in favor of the hypothesis, but is quietly disregarded whenever it makes against it?

It may be safely said that the diction of 1:1-2:4 gives no aid or comfort to the hypothesis: how is it with that of J in 2:4-3:24?

2) THE LANGUAGE OF J.

Forty words and expressions are adduced as characteristic of J in this section; and they are held to be significant, p. 21, since "they occur in what purports to be a treatment of the same subject." It has already been shown that this is an error. The subject is not and does not purport to be the same. It is distinctly announced both in the title, 2:4*a*, and in the opening words, v. 4*b*, that what follows is not a fresh account of the creation, but its sequel, viz. the first stage of human history transacted upon the scene already prepared for it. Ch. 3 is a narrative of the fall and in no sense parallel to ch. 1, and ch. 2 is purely preliminary to ch. 3.

In fact it is as inconsistent with the hypothesis of the critics as with that of unity of authorship to find here two divergent stories of the creation. The Redactor does not place them side by side as two varying accounts, which he makes no attempt to reconcile, but lays before his readers precisely as he found them. There is no intimation that they are alternatives, one or the other of which may be accepted at pleasure. On the contrary ch. 1 and ch. 2 are recorded as equally true, mutually supplementary and to be credited alike. Inconsistency apart, however, it is supposable that a compiler might place side by side related statements drawn from distinct sources, when a single writer would have wrought the whole into one continuous statement, thus avoiding needless repetition. It is a fair question, therefore, why the facts in ch. 2 concerning the creation of man

and his location in Eden were not included in ch. 1, and thus the necessity obviated of recurring to a matter already partially treated. The reason is not far to seek. Ch. 1 deals with the creation of the world as a whole. The scale upon which it is wrought is that of heaven, earth and sea. Man is introduced simply as the crowning apex of the vast pyramid of created things. The details of ch. 2 would here have been quite out of place and have marred the symmetry and grandeur of the entire description. They were hence reserved for a more appropriate place, and this is in accordance with the method of the writer elsewhere. Each of the ten books of generations, p. 19, into which Genesis is divided, is in a manner complete in itself, though this may require a return to what has been already stated in a different connection. Cf. 4:25,26 with 5:1-6; 5:32 and 6:5-8 with 6:9-13; 10:22-25 with 11:10-16; 11:26 with v. 27; 25:12 with 16:1 sqq. etc., etc.

While the theme of ch. 2 is not identical with that of ch. 1, matters previously treated are to a certain extent brought under review again, though with a different design and under a different aspect. Now the critics allege that J differs from P in the terms applied to the same acts and objects, thereby showing that it is by a different writer. We shall examine the cases adduced, retaining the numbers of pp. 23,24 for easier reference.

(1) עֵשָׂה for which P is said to use בָּרָא. But עֵשָׂה is used ten times in ch. 1, and of the same things as בָּרָא. Cf. 1:1 with vs. 7,8; 1:26 with v. 27; 1:21 with v. 25.

(2) The divine names will be considered hereafter.

(3) חֵיט הַשֶּׂדֶה, עֵשֶׂב הַשֶּׂדֶה, 2:5; (17) חֵיט הַשֶּׂדֶה 2:19,20. שִׁיחַ *bush* instead of עֵץ *tree*, as 1:11,12, has been explained already, and J has עֵץ 2:9 sqq.; שִׁיחַ besides in the entire Hexateuch only Gen. 21:15 E. It is not surprising, therefore, that it is not found in P. But why has J bush of the *field*, herb of the *field*, beast of the *field*, while P has beast of the *earth*, 1:24,25,30 and so 9:2,10? The open field is in tacit contrast with the enclosed and cultivated garden, see 3:18. "Beast of the field" is the ordinary phrase throughout the Bible. But terrestrial in contrast with aquatic animals, 1:21,22, and when the whole broad earth is spoken of, are naturally called beasts of the earth or land, cf. 1:29; Ex. 10:12,15 E.

(5) צִמָּח 2:5 J, for which P is said to use תּוֹצֵא 1:12; but P has צִמָּח Lev. 13:37, and J has it but once outside of the present narrative, Ex. 10:5; Gen. 41:6,23 belongs to E, a distinct writer.

(7) הָאָרֶץ 2:5 J, while P has הָאָרֶץ. But

these are not precise equivalents, as is shown by their discriminating use, 2:5; 4:12,14. When tillage is spoken of or productive soil, אֲדָמָה is the proper word and it so occurs 30 times. As P never mentions this, he has no occasion for the word in that sense. אֲדָמָה is also earth as a material, Gen. 2:7,19; 3:19; Ex. 20:24, of which P does not chance to speak. The surface of the ground is expressed by either term both by P and J. Thus אֲדָמָה with רָמַשׁ (noun or verb) P Gen. 1:25; 6:20; 9:2; J Gen. 7:8; Lev. 20:25. עַל פְּנֵי הָאָדָמָה Gen. 8:8 J, but עַל פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ v. 9; also Gen. 7:3; 11:4,8,9 J as well as Gen. 1:29 P; and but for the sharp critical practice which does not hesitate to sunder a clause from the midst of its paragraph, 8:13, with its פְּנֵי הָאָדָמָה would be assigned to P. The only thing at all peculiar is that while both P and J in numberless instances use אָרֶץ for the land of Canaan, אֲדָמָה is so used five times, four of which are referred to J, Gen. 28:15; Lev. 20:24; Num. 11:12; 32:11, and one to E, Ex. 20:12; and it is twice used by J for the whole earth מִשְׁפָּחוֹת הָאָדָמָה Gen. 12:3; 28:14, while the parallels הָאָרֶץ גִּוֵּי Gen. 18:18; 22:18; 26:4, though in a J connection are each time referred to R.

(8) *יצר* form J is not, as alleged, the equivalent of *ברא* create P. The latter emphasizes the immediate divine act, the former is suggestive of the material employed. In Isa. 43:1; 45:7, 12, 18 *יצר ברא* and *עשה* are used together and in the same sentence of God's almighty creative work. *יצר* form is not inconsistent with the creative *fiat* (p. 30), Isa. 44:24, 26-28. All that is said about "laboriously gathering materials, moistening the clay and shaping it by personal manipulation" belongs to the interpreter, not to the sacred record. The earth was moistened for the growth of plants, 2:5, 6, not with a view to the formation of man. *יצר* occurs nowhere in the Hexateuch except in this chapter; in the only other instance in which J alludes to the creation of man, he uses *ברא* Gen. 6:7. And if the absence of *יצר* from the rest of J has no significance, why is there any in its absence from P? A noun derived from this root occurs twice in J, Gen. 6:5; 8:21, both times in the narrative of the flood. If any meaning is attached to this, it can only be to link the accounts of the creation and the deluge together, as before hinted, and to sever them from the rest of Genesis.

(11) *נשמת חיים* J, while P is said to use *רוח חיים* (twice, viz., Gen. 6:17; 7:15), and *רוח* of the Spirit of God, 1:2. But *רוח* also in J, Gen. 6:3; Num. 11:29. *נשמה* occurs in all six times in the Pentateuch, four times in D and twice only in J, once without *רוח* Gen. 2:7, and once with it, 7:22, where the critics say that *רוח* is an interpolation by R, for no other reason than that it does not suit the hypothesis.

(12) *שנים* J, which P also uses Gen. 6:16 and often elsewhere; as to the allegation that P does and J does not use *נתן* in this sense see No. 12, language of P.

(13) *האדם* (37) *לאדם* common noun in J, proper noun in P. But J uses *אדם* as a proper noun 4:25 and P as a common noun, 1:26, 27; 5:2. If the argument proves anything, it proves that 5:2 is by a different writer from vs. 3-5.

(22) *נחש* 3:1 J; "P uses *תנין*." But the words are not equivalents. *תנין* means *extended*, and is applied to creatures of unusual length, marine animals, Gen. 1:21, as well as serpents Ex. 7:9, 10, 12. The application of a generic term in one passage and of a specific term in another

to the same thing, does not argue diversity of writers, unless a man who has once spoken of a snake cannot vary his expression and call it a reptile.

These are all the words in which the language of ch. 2 is contrasted with that of ch. 1; and every variation is readily explained by the connection and by the shade of meaning to be expressed.

There are two other words and two grammatical constructions in which the language of ch. 2, 3 is contrasted with that of P elsewhere.

(19) *סגר* 2:21 J for which P's equivalent is said to be *סכר*; but this latter only occurs once in the entire Hexateuch, Gen. 8:2; and P uses *סגר* Ex. 14:3.

(36) *הרכה ארכה* 3:16 J but twice beside in Hex., J 16:10, and R 22:17, who, according to Dillmann, has made a free addition of his own. In Ex. 32:13 J *ארכה* is without the infinitive, though based upon Gen. 22:17. How J could quote R, who by the hypothesis was subsequent to his time, it is not for me to say. But if J uses this combination in two places, and failed to employ it when there was such an obvious reason for his doing so, what is there surprising in its absence from P, who, moreover, does use the infin. abs. with the finite verb in other cases, e. g. Ex. 31:14, 15; Lev. 7:24; 10:18.

(38) *שמע לקול* 3:17 occurs in but two passages besides in J, Gen. 16:2; Ex. 4:8, 9. Ex. 3:18; 15:26; 18:24 belong to E. Commonly *שמע* has a different construction in J as it has in P.

(41) *נרש* in P only in Qal, it is said, while in J it is mostly in Piel. J has the Piel twice in Genesis, 3:24; 4:14, and three times in the rest of the Hexateuch, Ex. 2:17; 6:1; Num. 22:11, and the Qal once, Ex. 34:11, whereas in P it is the participle that is used. The Piel and Pual participles nowhere occur, their place being apparently supplied as in some other verbs by Qal forms. Moreover, as the tense-forms in Piel differ from those of Qal in the vowels only, how could J have written differently, if he meant to use the Qal in every case, unless he had the Massoretic points at his command?

These expressions are of so infrequent occurrence in J itself, that their not chancing

to be found in P warrants no inference of diversity of authorship.

In the remaining instances adduced it is not pretended that P and J express the same thought by means of different words or constructions, but simply that certain words or forms occur in J which are either not found at all or not with the same frequency in P. These are entirely irrelevant, and are so admitted to be, p. 24, unless two things are first shown, viz.:

1. That they are wanting in P for some other reason than simply that he has no occasion to use them. If J does and P does not say (6) *rain*; (10) *nose*; *anger*; (14) *desire* and (33) *heel*, what of it? Are we to infer that P did not know the names of the members of the body, or the words expressive of ordinary emotions or of familiar objects? If he wished to say "nose" or "heel," what else could he call them?

2. That their apparent absence from P is not itself due to the critics' having systematically shaped the sections which they assign to P so as to exclude them. If the documents P and J existed in a separate state, their respective diction could with some confidence be compared. But when the separation is first made by the critics themselves at their own pleasure, and the criterion of division is the assumed diction of each, the result corresponds with the hypothesis for the simple reason that it was fixed by the hypothesis. How can it be expected that a given word will be found in P, when its presence in any passage or clause is held to be decisive proof that the latter does not belong to P?

As no attempt is made to establish either of these points in respect to the rest of the words adduced as characteristic of J, there is absolutely nothing in them that calls for a reply. And there would not be, if the list were ten times as long. Arguments that prove nothing become no more cogent by being multiplied; unless the intention be to create the impression that where there is so much smoke there must be some fire. Identity of authorship is neither proved nor disproved by summing up the words in different paragraphs and estimating the proportion of those that are the same or that are unlike.

But besides this fatal defect in the argument, several of these words are of no force for the purpose for which they are adduced for the further reason that they are of rare occurrence and hence afford no indication of a writer's habitual diction.

Thus (9) *נפח* Gen. 2:7, (18) *בנה* spoken of God, 2:22, (23) *ערום* 3:1, are found nowhere else in the Hexateuch. The noun *עֶזֶר* (15) occurs nowhere in J except in 2:18,20, and the corresponding verb only occurs in J twice, Gen. 49:25; Deut. 32:33. The combination (6) *כִּנְנֶרְו* 2:18,20 is found nowhere else in the Bible, and *נָגַד* itself but twice besides in J in Genesis, 33:12; 47:15. The verb *פָּקַח* (25) occurs nowhere in J but in Gen. 3:5,7; an adjective derived from it is found once in J Ex. 4:11 and but once besides in the Bible. (26) *שָׁכַל* 3:6 occurs but once besides in J, Gen. 48:14. (27) *חָבֵא* Gen. 3:8,10 occurs again in an E context, where Dillmann thinks it was "probably an insertion from J," and six times in Joshua, where it is in each case uncertain whether it belongs to J or not. (34) The noun *עֶצֶב* 3:16 occurs nowhere else in the Hexateuch; *עֶצְבוֹן* 3:16,17, but once besides in the Bible, 5:29, with direct allusion to the former passage. The verb *עָצַב* occurs in the Hexateuch three times, Gen. 6:6 J; 34:7, which is sandwiched between two verses of P and is itself a curious critical conglomerate, having a phrase of D and another of E, but all assigned to J on account of *עָצַב* and *חָרָה*; and finally 45:5, which is in an E connection; but both verbs occur again and without regard to strict consistency with the former decision a compromise is effected and one is assigned to J, the other to E. (35) The noun *הָרוֹן* 3:16 is found nowhere else in the Bible. The cognate verb *הָרָה* is in Gen. 21:2 referred to P by Dillmann; but Kautzsch and Socin cut out the clause and assign it to J avowedly on the ground that it always belongs to either J or E.

The only words in the whole list that have any show of plausibility are the particles, viz. (4) *טָרַם*; (20) *וְהַפֵּעַם*; (21) *עַל כֵּן*; (24) *פֶּן*; (28) *אִי* or *אִיה*; (29) *לְבַלְתִּי*; (30) *וְזֹאת*; (39) *מָה*; (40) *עֵתָה*. Such words of relation are not so directly determined by the subject treated and hence might seem to betray more the writer's style of thought. But even here

the bare fact of their occurrence or non-occurrence in certain paragraphs is not of itself an available argument. It must first be shown that they occur in one and not in the other, where there was equal occasion for employing them, and that the paragraphs have not been adjusted with the view of including or excluding them according to a preconceived hypothesis. The reasonableness of this demand may be illustrated by a few examples. **בָּטָרָם** occurs but once in J in Genesis (2:5), and **בָּטָרָם** but once in J in Genesis (45:28), unless Dillmann is

right as against Wellhausen in assigning 37:18b to him; and yet Dillmann in 27:4,33 makes **בָּטָרָם** a mark of E in distinction from J. Gen. 30:20b in an E connection is attributed to J simply because **הַפְעֵם** must always belong to him. Knobel and Nöldeke were inconsiderate enough to allow Ex. 15:23 with its **עַל כֵּן** to P, but other critics have since come to the rescue and taken it from him. Nöldeke also gave Lev. 20:4; Num. 9:7 to P; but the presence of **לְבַלֵּת** in these verses has determined later critics to assign them differently.

How much weight critics themselves attach to the arguments thus far reviewed, even when fortified by the additional considerations drawn from the style and the theology of these opening sections, appears from the statement, p. 24, "The first chapter of Genesis is supposed by most critics not to be original with P, but to have been incorporated by him in his work from some outside source. If this is true, it should not be cited as a specimen of P's style." It is added immediately after, "Ch. 2:4b-3:25, on the other hand, is an excellent specimen of J." But the venerable Dr. Reuss, the father of the present reigning school of criticism, is of a different mind. He declares positively,* "The Jehovist did not write chs. 2,3," and expresses grave doubts about the ascription to him of any of the passages attributed to him in Gen. chs. 1-11, adding that the old supplementary hypothesis can scarcely be escaped in dealing with some of these passages. Wellhausen†, too, the acknowledged leader of the school, has reached the same conclusion in respect to Gen. chs. 2,3 on different grounds, contending that it was not written by the J of the rest of Genesis or of the Hexateuch generally. When the critics are thus at variance, who is to decide between them? and what is to be thought of the arguments from diction, style and theology, as tests of authorship, which eminent scholars can thus unceremoniously set aside as inconclusive? So that, after toiling through these alleged marks of P in ch. 1, and of J in chs. 2,3, we are told at last, on high authority, that P did not write the one nor J the other, and that all the supposed criteria are meaningless.

Before leaving the diction of these chapters, attention should be drawn to some indications that they are not, as has been claimed, from separate and independent documents. It is generally conceded that the use of **יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים** throughout chs. 2,3, is a tacit reference to ch. 1. This combination of divine names occurs nowhere else with such regularity and frequency, though it is found sporadically in other passages, e. g. Ex. 9:30; 2 Sam. 7:22,25; 1 Chron. 17:16,17; Jon. 4:6. This both relieves it from the charge of being "an un-Hebraic expression," p. 23, and sets aside Hupfeld's notion that it is adopted here without refer-

* *Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*, p. 255 sqq.

† *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 13.

ence to ch. 1 as peculiarly appropriate to the state of paradise, from which there is a descent to Jehovah alone after the fall, just as P is supposed to rise from Elohim in the patriarchal period to Jehovah in the days of Moses. The union of the names is intended to suggest that Jehovah now first introduced is identical with Elohim before spoken of in ch. 1. It is employed with evident allusion to the contents of ch. 1, and it pervades chs. 2,3. The critics say that Elohim was here introduced by R, though he is ordinarily chary of meddling with the divine names. But this must be viewed in connection with various other indications which enter into the tissue of these passages and are not so easily disposed of.

Note, for example, such facts as the following: If the construction of בראשית 1:1 adopted by Dillmann and favored p. 22 is correct, there is a remarkable similarity in structure, the more striking because it is unusual in Hebrew style, between P 1:1-3 and J 2:4b-7; a noun with ב in construction before the following verb begins the sentence, a circumstantial clause of some length is then introduced, and the principal sentence is continued by a future with a Waw Consec. J 2:4b strikingly resembles P 5:1b in the form of expression; so do 1:4a P and 6:2a J; 1:31a, 6:12a P, 8:13b J. ארץ without the article 1:24 P as

2:4 J. The paronomasia וברו וברו 1:2; פרו 2:4 J. The paronomasia וברו וברו 1:22,28 P recalls in J ארמה.... אדם 2:7; עפר ואפר 4:14; נע ונר 23; אשה.... איש 18:27. The first pers. plur. used of God, 1:26 P, notwithstanding the strictness of Hebrew monotheism has its counterpart in J 3:22; 11:7. 2:4b J is an explicit allusion to the preceding account of the formation of the universe, as 5:1b is to that of the creation of man. The use of עשה made 3:1 J in reference to the beasts instead of עצר formed as 2:19 J, is a reminiscence of 1:25 P. כרובים cherubim 3:24 J occurs in the Pentateuch besides only in P.

In addition to verbal coincidences and allusions, the distribution of the matter between these two sections gives evidence of pre-arrangement and cannot be purely accidental. This is recognized p. 27, in calling one "generic" and the other "individual." The creation of the world at large, heaven, earth and sea with all that they contain, is stated in ch. 1 and assumed in ch. 2. The latter simply gives details, which were necessarily passed over in the plan of the former, respecting the separate formation of man and woman and fitting up the garden for their habitation. Ch. 2:19 is the only apparent exception to the specific and limited character of this section. But even this is no real exception, since it is obvious, as has already been shown, that what the writer really means to say and what according to the laws of Hebrew speech he does say, is not that the beasts were originally made with the motive stated in v. 18, but that this furnished the occasion of God's bringing them to Adam to receive their names. Again, God gave names to certain things in ch. 1, Adam gave names to others in chs. 2,3; and these are precisely adjusted to one another, neither duplicating nor omitting any. God gave names to day and night, heaven, earth and seas 1:5,8,10, and to Adam 5:1. Adam gave names to the inferior animals 2:20 and to Eve 2:23, 3:20.

And while it is plain that chs. 2,3 is thus adjusted to ch. 1, it is no less clear that 1:1-2:3 anticipates what is to follow and purposely prepares the way for it. 1. The emphasis with which it is repeated at the close of each creative act "and God saw that it was good," 1:4,10,12, etc., and affirmed at the end of the whole

"behold, it was very good," v. 31, would be unmeaning except as a designed preliminary to the reverse which was shortly to follow in the fall ch. 3. And this moreover is necessary to explain the otherwise unaccountable declaration 6:11 that "the earth was corrupt before God," the mystery of which is unrelieved by anything that P contains.

2. Ch. 2:3 is evidently preliminary to the fourth commandment Ex. 20:8-11, which again in its terms distinctly refers back to 1:1-2:3. The ten commandments in Ex. 20 are by the critics referred to E, with which according to Dillmann J was acquainted. He must, therefore, have known and believed that the world was created in six days, and can have written nothing in Gen. chs. 2,3 inconsistent with this belief. This can only be evaded by alleging that the commandments are not preserved in Ex. 20 in their genuine original form. Dillmann disputes Ex. 20:11, because a different reason is given for observing the Sabbath in Deut. 5:15. But Ex. 20 is the authentic transcript, while Deut. 5 is a reproduction with hortatory modifications. This Dillmann admits in other instances; but Delitzsch very properly contends that this is no exception. The rejection of the verse is simply the usual device of the critics for disposing of whatever contravenes their hypothesis. Instead of adapting their hypothesis to the phenomena presented by the text, they insist upon remodeling the text into accordance with their hypothesis. The advantage of this method is that the critic can thus triumphantly establish whatever he sets out to prove.

The inner relation of the early chapters of Genesis and of the various sections in this book and in the rest of the Pentateuch which are held to be most closely connected with them severally, is of prime importance in determining the constitution of the Pentateuch and in seeking to obtain a satisfactory view of the method in which it originated. Adopting the critical nomenclature P and J as convenient designations of the portions to which they are ordinarily applied, without any prepossessions for or against their original separateness, it may be confidently affirmed that they cannot possibly represent independent and unrelated documents, as the critics commonly assume, as though each was written without reference to the other and with no knowledge of its existence. Pursuing the same general plan and running parallel to each other to such an extent that they were capable of being intertwined as we now find them, having besides so many points of connection in the way of direct allusions or presuppositions and implications, such as we have already discovered and as will appear more and more as we advance, they certainly have much more in common than can be explained as fortuitous coincidences of quite independent writers.

And when the critics go farther and, for the sake of making their original separateness more complete, claim that P and J are in repeated instances mutually inconsistent and contradictory, their hypothesis is suicidal. No intelligent redactor could have combined them as they are combined.

III. SECTION 2.—GEN. 4,5.

It is affirmed 1) that the genealogy preserved by J ch. 4:1,17-22 and that given by P ch. 5 are not, as they appear to be, two separate lines of descent from Adam, but are "practically the same," p. 36. One and the same list of names has by some blunder been attached to different ancestors, and been converted into two races of opposite character, that of ungodly Cain and of godly Seth. 2) That ch. 4 J is at variance with itself and with other parts of the J document.

1. The two Genealogies not Identical.

Their identity is asserted purely on the ground of the remarkable similarity of names, p. 35. But

1. This is to set aside explicit and repeated historical testimony for no other reason than mere conjecture. It is gratuitously assumed not only that two genealogies recorded respectively by J and by P are the same, though professedly different; but this though on the critics' own theory P's genealogy is independently confirmed by J. The line Adam, Seth, Enosh is traced Gen. 4:25,26 J as well as 5:3-6 P, and as the critics assign 5:29 to J as another fragment of the same, p. 36 (1), these broken and scattered links in J utter the same voice with the more complete record of P, declaring that Noah and his father Lamech were descended not from Cain but from Seth. The distinctness of the two lines is moreover positively affirmed by calling Seth "another seed instead of Abel whom Cain slew."

2. It requires a vast amount of critical manipulation to get rid of this testimony. In 4:25 the word "again" in the first clause, and the whole of the last clause after the word וְאֵת viz. "another instead of Abel whom Cain slew" must be thrown out as an interpolation by R. The statement 4:1 that Cain was the son of Adam and Eve must be gotten out of the way to make him the same as Kenan the son of Enosh 5:9. The story of Cain and Abel must have been removed by R from its original place at a later point in the history. And Abel, as Wellhausen does not hesitate to say, is another name for Jabal, 4:20, of the sixth generation after Cain. All this wonderful medley is for the sake of consistently carrying through a conjecture, which implies that R was devoid of sense, and that neither P nor J understood the materials which they had before them, but which are so obvious to modern critics.

3. But it is said "It cannot be called a mere coincidence that the names are so nearly alike." Is it then an unheard-of thing that different persons should bear the same name? Does it discredit the roll of the kings of England, that the succession Edward-Richard-Henry occurs more than once in the course of it? If some one should affirm the identity of the German emperor Maximilian with the late unhappy ruler of Mexico, or of Saul the king of Israel with Saul of Tarsus, or of General Butler with the chief Butler of Pharaoh in the time of Joseph, would it be thought best to reconstruct history on this basis?

Delitzsch directs attention to the fact that but two names are the same in the entire series, viz. Enoch and Lamech. The first means *initiation* or *consecration*, and might very well be applied in the former sense to the first son of Cain born in exile as subsequently to the first born of Reuben, Gen. 46:9, and in the latter sense to that holy man who walked with God and was not for God took him. The meaning of the name Lamech is unknown: but the identification of the persons so called is forbidden by the speeches preserved from them, which reflect totally diverse characters. Cain and Kenan, Irad and Jared are distinct not merely in their form but in their radical letters and probable signification; so is the second and determining member in the compound names Methushael and Methuselah. The statement, p. 36 (5), that "a slight alteration has taken place" in these names is simply a confession that they are not the same. The hint, p. 36 note, of "a desire on the part of the writer to give to the descendants of Cain names with a bad meaning and to the descendants of Seth names with a good meaning" appears to find some confirmation in Mahalalel *praise of God* which stands over against Mehujael *smitten of God*.

Does not this in fact suggest a plausible solution of the whole mystery? The meaning of the most of these ancient names cannot now be ascertained. It is natural to suppose, however, that they are Hebrew representatives either of the names actually borne by these antediluvians or of appropriate designations subsequently applied to them. The disposition to produce like-sounding contrasts shown in Isa. 5:7, *מעקה-צדקה*, *משפח-משפט*, or by slight modifications, as of Beelzebub into Beelzebul, or Shechem into Sychar, to give a different turn to the meaning of words may have ruled in producing the parallelisms of these lists, in which the same or similar names may have had different though appropriate senses. The fact also that the LXX. has two more names common to both lists than the Hebrew, suggests the tendency in such cases to come into a closer approximation in the course of repeated transcription.* That the larger portion of these names is no longer capable of a satisfactory explanation is not surprising, considering their very high antiquity and the multitude of other proper names which were doubtless significant at first, but which are not explicable now.

4. Gen. 5:3 does not necessarily imply that Seth was the first child of Adam, any more than Ex. 2:1,2 implies that Moses was the oldest child of his parents, though v. 4 declares the contrary, not to speak of Ex. 7:7.

2. No Discrepancy in Gen. ch. 4.

It is said that 4:17-24 is at variance with the rest of the chapter and with the J document generally in respect both 1) to the life of Cain and 2) the fact of the deluge. It is hence claimed that it must be considered to be an extract from some older document, J¹, which has been incorporated in J.

* Cf. "Kabil" and "Habil," the Mohammedan names for Cain and Abel. Sale's Koran, note to ch. 5:30.

1. J represents Cain, vs. 11,14, as condemned for the murder of his brother to be a fugitive and vagabond in the earth; according to J¹ he led a settled life and built a city, v. 17. *a.* It then remains to be accounted for, if these stories are in such direct antagonism, how R could have put them together without explanation or remark, as though he perceived no conflict between them and had no idea that his readers would suspect any. *b.* The fact is, that Cain was expelled from the seat of God's presence, the society of man and cultivated land to the wild steppes of the land of Nod (so called from נֹד in his sentence, equivalent to the Nomad region). The Hebrew עִיר *city* is in usage broad enough to cover a nomadic encampment, Num. 13:19, cf. 2 Kgs. 17:9. The dread lest his murder might be avenged, v. 14, betrayed itself afresh in his constructing such a defence for himself and his family, which subsequently may have grown from these small beginnings into much larger proportions.* The builders of the first huts on the site of Chicago may be said to have laid the foundations of that city. *c.* Cain had previously been a tiller of the ground. That he continued to be "an agriculturist," p. 60, is certainly not stated in the text, and is in fact inconsistent with it. The arts developed by his descendants are those of nomads, viz., pasturage, music and mining, but not the cultivation of the soil. Jabal was "the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle" in a very different sense from that in which Abel was "a keeper of sheep" at his paternal home.

2. That these nomadic arts could not have been developed prior to the deluge or that the fact of such development would not have been mentioned by the writer, had he known of the deluge, is certainly not obvious enough to justify the assertion, p. 60, that "this could have been written only by one who knew of no interruption of human history by the deluge."

a. It is said in defence of this astonishing statement, p. 37 (10), that this "gives us the origin of the arts as they existed in the time of the writer." But this leaves out of view the fact that agriculture and all that pertains to it is not one of these arts, and yet to the Hebrew mind this was the chief of human occupations, the one most favored and principally regarded in their national constitution and upon which their whole scheme of life was based. Such an oversight on the part of J¹ becomes all the more unaccountable upon the critical hypothesis that it was written after the settlement in Canaan. So far is it from being true that "the three sons of Lamech are made the fathers of the world, classified according to types of civilization," p. 61 (5).

b. That the genealogy of Cain breaks off, as it does, without being continued, like every other genealogy in Genesis, to tribes or persons existing in the writer's own day is a strong presumptive evidence that the race was extinct. Wellhausen intrepidly suggests that Cain is a collective name for the Kenites, Num. 24:22,

* Observe the form of statement in the Hebrew, which is significant, וַיִּבְנֶה "he was building a city" as a work in progress, not "he built it," as though it was completed by him.

p. 37 (10), who are thus traced up to the origin of mankind; a piece of historical criticism akin to that which finds an allusion to South America in "the gold of Parvaim," 2 Chron. 3:6, since Parvaim is the dual of Peru.

c. The allusion in 4:24 to v. 15 plainly shows that the narrative of Lamech belongs to the same record with that of Cain and Abel. Dillmann can find no escape from this but either by putting the cart before the horse and supposing that the allusion is the other way, so that the language of Lamech may have given rise to the story of Cain's murder, or else by ejecting the troublesome clause from the text as an addition by R. It is said without further explanation, p. 60 (6), that "a study of the different senses in which **קם שבעתים** is used in these passages, serves really to support the idea of different authorship." The different senses amount to this, that Cain was to be avenged by the Lord; Lamech boasts that he will be avenged in a higher measure by weapons that he carries himself. But how this supports diversity of authorship remains to be shown. The appeal to Budde, p. 60, *note*, means just this, that if he is suffered to change the text and convert the passive into an active verb, he can thereby render the reference to v. 15 inappropriate.

3. The Critical Partition.

1) THE LANGUAGE OF P.

It is intimated (p. 33) that the whole of ch. 5 except a few words is characteristic of P. Precisely the contrary is the fact, as any one can see who approaches the subject without bias and with no hypothesis to support. There is no reason for connecting this chapter with P any more than with J, or for supposing that this genealogy ever formed a part of the document P before it was included in the Book of Genesis.

1. It is linked to the same extent and in precisely the same manner with P and with J. After the opening title, which will be considered apart, 5:1-3 borrows the language of 1:26-28 P; 5:29 that of 3:17 J. The genealogy is traced from Adam to Noah and his three sons, all of whom are alike named in P and in J. "Called his" or "their name," 5:2,3,29, corresponds with 4:25,26 J; **קח*** as a verb comparatively rare, 5:5 as 3:22 J; "walked with God," 5:22, coincides with 6:9 P. Beyond these express allusions to and coincidences with P and J alike, there is nothing to ally it with either. The critics say that 5:29 is an insertion by R. They do so simply because their hypothesis requires it and for no other reason. There is precisely the same ground for saying that R inserted 5:1,2 and modified 5:3. Both passages stand on the same footing, and should be dealt with in the same way. The natural inference from the facts of the case is that the writer of Genesis had before him an old genealogical register from which he extracted the

* Found also Gen. 11:12,14; 25:7 in a genealogy or a statement extracted from a genealogy, and besides in the Hexateuch only Ex. 1:16 E, 33:20 J, Num. 21:8,9 E, Lev. 18:5 (Dillmann doubtful whether P or J), 25:35 (Dillmann P): Kayser denies that either is from P.

statements of this chapter (as subsequently 11:10-26), and in doing so he inserted these allusions to what he had already written.

2. In this way the peculiarity of the title of ch. 5 finds its most satisfactory explanation. "This is *the book* of the generations of Adam." This form of expression does not recur again. In drawing from the beginning of this old volume, its exact title is retained. And the remaining titles of Genesis, which, as we have seen, occur in P and in J connections alike, are framed upon this model; only, as they were not separate books, they are not so called, but simply "these are the generations," etc.

3. The form of the pre-Abrahamic history is thus best accounted for. This ancient genealogical history supplies the framework, and the narrative is inserted between its links. The line of descent is traced regularly to Noah when the departure from analogy in naming three sons, 5:32, instead of one, and arresting the genealogy, imply that an important epoch has been reached. The narrative of the deluge is then inserted (including the time of its occurrence, 7:6,11), after which the unfinished term in the genealogy is completed, 9:28,29, in language identical with ch. 5.

Ch. 5 certainly does not support the current critical hypothesis. So far as it indicates anything, it throws its weight in favor of the still older hypothesis of Vitranga.

2) THE LANGUAGE OF J.

The numbers are those of p. 32.

(1) האדם, see (13), (37) of previous section. "J employs sparingly proper names." Yet J names Adam, 4:25; Eve, 4:1, 3:20 (arbitrarily assigned to R); Cain and Abel (cf. in P 5:4); Cain's descendants, Seth, Enosh, Noah, Shem, Ham, Japheth, Nimrod, and many others in ch. 10; Terah, Abram, Nahor, Sarai, Milcāh, Iscāh, Hagar, Keturah and her children, etc., etc.; and the sacred name Jehovah, while P has the common noun Elohīm.

(2) דיע as a euphemism four times in J, twice in J₁, three times in P. There is no difference in the case that affects the meaning of the word.

(3) כף in the sense of *again* is referred to J or E, except in Lev. 26:18 P¹.

(4) רעה keep sheep, (5) עבר הארמה till the ground, dig wells (used by J in but one narrative, 26:19,21,22,32), water flocks, are "frequent in J, but not found in P." It is to be presumed that he had heard of such things, and knew the proper words for them, but had no occasion to speak of them. This also applies to (9) רבץ,

(10) זעק (זעק once in P), (12) כח, (14) אהל, (23) נחם.

(6) מנחה is used by J of three things, viz., the offering of Cain and Abel, 4:3,4,5; Jacob's present to Esau, 33:10; his present to the governor of Egypt, 43:11,15,25,26. P uses the word freely when he has occasion for it, Ex. 29:41, etc.

(7) שעה Gen. 4:4,5 J; Ex. 5:9 E; nowhere else in Hexateuch.

(8) חרה mostly referred to J or E. On Josh 7:1 Dillmann says, "This is a fragment from P as is shown by Josh. 22:20 P, only instead of 'ויהי קצף' he must have said, 'ויהי אף' which would suit the hypothesis better.

(10) צעק commonly referred to E; but how this is accomplished may be illustrated from Ex. 14:15, where a clause is cut out of a verse belonging to P solely and avowedly because it contains צעק.

(11) פצה occurs but once besides in J.

(13) ילד "J 'to beget,' for which P uses ילד." הוליד is limited to J only by critical

legerdemain. Gen. 22:23 is referred to J notwithstanding the allusion by P in 25:20, which makes it necessary to assume that P had stated the same thing in some other passage now lost; this also carries with it 22:20, whose allusion to 11:29 requires the latter to be torn from its connection and referred to J. In 25:3 יֵלֶךְ alternates with וַיֵּבֶן, which is made a criterion of P in ch. 10, cf. also 46:9 sqq.; Ex. 6:15 sqq.

Nos. 14-22 occur in J¹, who is by the hypothesis a distinct writer from J, and cannot therefore be adduced in evidence of his diction. (18) הָאִיִּן, (19) פָּצַע, (21) חֲבוּרָה do not occur in J at all. The same is probably true of (16) הָיָא אֲבִי, since in 10:21 הָיָא belongs to a different clause from אֲבִי; 11:29, 22:21 הָיָא does

not occur, and the reference of 19:37,38 is doubtful; Kautzsch at least ascribes these verses to R. (15) כָּנֹר, (17) שָׁם אַחֲיוּ, (22) חָלַל meaning to be the first, occur but once in J. (20) יָלַךְ (noun) with the exception of 44:20, occurs in but one narrative in J, 32:23; 33:1-14, which seems best accounted for by supposing that this word belonged to that story in its oral or written form, and is here accordingly retained.

(24) The only word under this number not before remarked upon is תְּשֻׁקָה, occurring but twice in the Hexateuch, Gen. 3:6; 4:7, and each time according to Wellhausen, Budde, Kuenen and Kittel by a different writer, p. 62.

3) SUBDIVISION OF THE DOCUMENTS.

It is a curious circumstance that, while Dillmann and Wellhausen agree that 4:1b-15 (or 16) J and vs. 1a,16(or 17)-24 J¹ must be from different writers, and that one of these wrote chs. 2, 3, they are at strife as to which it was. Dillmann adduces what he considers clear proofs from diction and style that chs. 2, 3 belong to J. Wellhausen and those who follow him in this particular set these aside without ceremony and attribute these chapters to J¹. Dillmann, with some hesitation, it is true, identifies J¹ with E; others make them quite distinct. To these indications of the inconclusiveness of critical arguments in the view of the critics themselves add the intimation, p. 59, that it may be considered an open question "whether J¹ is to be taken as the original, J² being an interpolation; or J² is the real J, J¹ having been incorporated," that is to say, whether the sections of J¹ or those assigned to J² are by the same hand as those attributed to J in the rest of Genesis. If this is not the meaning, the remark would seem to be superfluous. That it was so intended appears to be implied p. 32 (1), where J² is apparently distinguished from J, although they are commonly identified. Such admissions leave one in doubt of the infallibility of the critical sense in some other cases.

The discovery of successive strata in each document severally, announced by Wellhausen, and in which he has been eagerly followed since, is simply a return to the principles and methods of the fragmentary hypothesis. Their adoption can only result in an indefinite disintegration of the documents and a destruction of the entire basis on which their existence is supposed to rest, as appears most plainly in the results already reached respecting the priestly legislation. It is the inevitable nemesis of the hypothesis reacting upon itself. The very principles and methods which are employed in dividing the Pentateuch into different documents, can be applied with like success and quite as much cogency in the division and subdivision of each of the documents to any assignable extent.

4) DUPLICATE STATEMENTS.

Dillmann thinks that the composite character of the Book of Genesis is shown more plainly in the duplicate mention of the birth of Seth and Enosh, 4:25, 26: 5:3-6, than anywhere else. Why should the same writer thus repeat himself?

The critics see in 4:25,26 the beginning of a genealogy by J, to which 5:29 also belonged. It is held, therefore, that J must have given the line of descent from Adam to Noah in full, parallel to that by P in ch.5; but that R, while omitting the greater portion as needless repetition, saw fit to retain these three verses because of the additional information which they convey. Ch. 5:29 was inserted from J in the body of P's genealogy, but 4:25,26 R saw fit to preserve distinct. Now it is difficult to see why the same motive, be it what it might, which determined R not to blend 4:25,26 with the corresponding verses of ch. 5, as he had done 5:29, might not be similarly influential with the original writer. Some reasons for such a separate statement naturally offer themselves.

1. One arises out of the original plan of the Book of Genesis and its division into successive sections, each in a manner complete in itself and introduced by its own special title, "these are the generations," etc. This division is unfortunately obscured to the common reader by the familiar division into chapters. The preceding section, 2:4-ch. 4, had recorded a constant descent from bad to worse, the sin of our first parents, their expulsion from paradise, the murder of Abel, Cain's descendants reaching in Lamech the climax of boastful and unrestrained violence. That the section might not be suffered to end in unrelieved gloom, a brighter outlook is added at the close, precisely as in 6:8. Seth is substituted for Abel whom Cain slew, and instead of piety perishing with murdered Abel it reaches a new development in the days of Enosh.

2. These closing verses are further necessary to the proper understanding of ch. 5. While the insertion of these statements in that chapter would have been confusing and would have marred its symmetry, it was important to set 5:3 in its true light in relation to 5:1,2, as is done by 4:25, and to indicate the character of the race of Seth in contrast with the ungodly race of Cain, as is done by 4:26.

The whole bears evidence of adaptation and careful thought, and is suggestive of one author, not the combination of separate compositions prepared with no reference to each other.

A further indication of the same sort, implying the original unity of these chapters, is their correspondence with the general plan of Genesis in respect to genealogies. Uniformly the divergent lines are first traced before proceeding with the principal line of descent leading to the chosen people. Ch. 10 the various nations of mankind sprung from the three sons of Noah, then 11:10 sqq. the line from Shem to Abram. Nahor's descendants 22:20 sqq., those of Keturah 25:1 sqq., and of Ishmael verses 12 sqq., before those of Isaac verses 19 sqq. Those of Esau 36:1 sqq. before those of Jacob 37:2 sqq. In like manner the

degenerate and God-forsaken race of Cain is traced 4:17 sqq. before proceeding with that of Seth ch. 5. Is this conformity with the constant plan of the book the accidental result of the junction of two documents of diverse character, independently prepared with no reference to each other?

IV. SECTION 3.—GEN. 6:1-9:29.

The divisive hypothesis is now getting into deeper waters, of which the narrative of the deluge is at once a symbol and an occasion. Hitherto it has had an ostensible ground for partition in distinct sections determined either by the alternation of divine names or by the change of subject or by both combined. Now this resource forsakes it, and it must venture on the open sea, destitute of chart or compass. And this is but a premonition of the reefs and shallows, cross-currents and whirlpools, fogs and storms, and every peril known to navigators, which must be encountered in its hazardous course. If the history of literature affords an ampler illustration of "confusion worse confounded" than the hopelessly inextricable medley in which the critics find themselves in their attempts to struggle through the three middle books of the Pentateuch, and that acquisition of doubtful value to themselves which they have recently annexed to form a Hexateuch, the Book of Joshua, it has never yet been discovered.

We are told, p. 39, that "this section contains two entirely distinct accounts of the deluge," and pp. 46 sqq., that these accounts differ irreconcilably in several respects. Let us inquire into the correctness of these statements.

1. No Duplicate Account of the Deluge.

It is alleged, p. 46, that "the material is throughout duplicated." But this is clearly a mistake. The narrative contains no superfluous repetition. The idea that it does arises from confounding things which differ, or from overlooking reasons which naturally led in the plan of the writer to a re-statement in a different connection of certain particulars which, in an event so extraordinary, so graphically related and upon the details of which the writer dwells with such evident interest, is surely not surprising.

Apparently the most plausible instance meets us at the outset. Gen. 6:5-8 Jehovah sees the wickedness of men and resolves to destroy them all except Noah; whereupon follow verses 9-13, in which Elohim sees the wickedness of men and announces to Noah his purpose to destroy them. Is not here a clear case in which there is first a statement by J, then a repetition of the very same statement by P? Not at all; vs. 6,7 declare the divine purpose, verse 13 the announcement of this purpose to Noah, which is quite distinct and carries the narrative forward a step further. Observe also that in the scheme of the book a new section begins 6:9. In order to the completeness of this section it is introduced with a statement of the situation. The sons of Noah are named afresh,

6:10; cf. 5:32; but no one suspects a difference of writer on this account; see a like summary of previous statements for the same reason 25:19,20; so the wickedness of men in the sight of God is re-stated in a few words 6:11,12, as preliminary to the declaration of his purpose.

Elohim directs Noah to build an ark for the preservation of himself and every species of living things, which Noah does, 6:14-22. Jehovah then bids Noah to enter the ark, taking some of all living creatures with him; which Noah does, 7:1-5. These paragraphs plainly belong together, each incomplete without the other. By assigning the former to P and the latter to J, J is made to assume the existence of the ark, though he has said nothing of its being built; and P records the construction of the ark, but after it is finished God never tells him to enter it. The consequence is that the critics have no sooner sundered these paragraphs than, in order to restore the connection, they are straightway obliged to assume that J must have written something just like 6:14-22, and P something just like 7:1-5, only R did not think proper to preserve it. He made up his account with a paragraph from P and another from J, which though written quite independently, dovetail precisely as if written continuously.

Ch. 7:7-9 records Noah's entry into the ark with his family and some of all living things; then in vs. 13-16 their entry into the ark is mentioned again. The critics say that the same identical thing is here stated first by J, then by P. But in assigning vs. 7-9 to J they violate their own criteria in almost every particular. "Noah and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives with him" (not "all his house" as 7:1), רמש "creeping," "two and two" (no mention of "seven and seven" as 7:2), "male and female," and "Elohim" are all declared to be marks of P. It is a sheer subterfuge to say with Dillmann that R has here freely modified the text "in order to compose the differences as far as possible." Why he should be concerned just here to alter forms of expression which he retains without change elsewhere, or to reconcile differences which no pains are taken to remove in other places, does not appear. And this is particularly insupposable in the present instance; for the only reason why R can be imagined to have used the statements of both documents, instead of only one, as in other cases, is that he might preserve what was peculiar in each. And yet we are told that he has himself neutralized the very end he had in view by conforming one to the other. The fact is that there is no indication of two documents or of a duplicate narrative here at all, any more than there is in the twofold statement of the time of the flood 7:6,11, where no one suspects a difference of writers. Precisely as the date of the flood is first given generally, the year only being named, and then more specifically by the month and the day, so the entry into the ark is first stated in general terms, and then "the selfsame day" on which it took place is accurately fixed. And if the criteria of the critics are of any worth, there was but one writer in the case.

From 7:11 to 8:20 the name Jehovah occurs but once, viz., 7:16*b*, which is for this reason held to belong to J. With this sole exception there is not throughout the passage just indicated a word or a phrase that is elsewhere claimed as characteristic of J,* and the assigning of any portion of it to that document is purely arbitrary and without justification on the ground of diction, style, theology or anything else. Hupfeld succeeded in picking out a clause here and a clause there from the sentences to which they belonged, and thus made a shift to preserve the continuity of J. But he had no warrant for so doing except, as Delitzsch fitly phrases it, "the omnipotence resident in the ink of a German scholar."

Ch. 7:12 is sundered from its connection and given to J because of its correspondence with v. 4. Yet *נֶשֶׁם* *rain*, v. 12, is quite different from *מָטָר*, v. 4, and nowhere occurs in J, though rain is repeatedly mentioned. It is found but once in the Hexateuch, Lev. 26:4, about whose authorship the critics are not agreed. The number "forty" surely is not peculiar to J. P is not precluded from saying that it rained forty days and nights, because J had said that it would do so, whether this be supposed to be the historical fact or merely the current belief. P speaks elsewhere of periods of forty days and forty years, Lev. 12:2,4; Num. 13:25; 14:34. Just here the perplexity of the critics in respect to 7:17*a* is instructive. "The flood was forty days upon the earth" is given entire by Dillmann to J, by Kuenen to R, and with the exception of the words "forty days," by Kautzsch and Socin to P; also by Hupfeld to P without exception, only the "forty days" must be understood differently from J in 7:4. All is with the design of bringing J and P into conflict regarding the duration of the flood; so that is effected, they are not particular about the mode of accomplishing it.

The attempt to set v. 12 in contrast with v. 11*b*, as though something belonging to a different order of things was intended, cannot be called successful. The opening of the windows of heaven cannot by possibility suggest anything but deluging rains, even to those who would fasten upon the sacred writer the conception of a supernal ocean and literal flood-gates in the sky, and this conclusion is further rendered necessary by the Hebrew phrase, v. 12. The Waw Consec. future indicates that the rain was not a separate and independent thing, but the sequence of opening the windows of heaven.

For similar reasons it is equally arbitrary and unwarranted to sunder the first two clauses of 8:2 from the last clause, assigning the former to P and the latter to J.

* The only plausible instance that can be adduced is 7:22, "in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life," compared with 2:7 J, where, however, the reference is to man alone and the phrase is "breath of life." It equally stands in relation to 6:17 and 7:15 P, where the reference is to the lower animals as well, and the phrase is "spirit of life"; a relation which the critics acknowledge, when they seek to expunge *רוּחַ* *spirit* from 7:22 by ascribing it to R. *קוֹחַ* 7:23, which occurs once in J 7:4, once in D, Deut. 11:6, and nowhere else in the Bible, is not to the point. Nor is *מַחֲוֶה* 7:23, which besides 6:7 and 7:4 is to be found only Ex. 32:32,33, in J, and occurs in P, Num. 5:23. Nor *חֲלוֹן* 8:6, which is found besides in the Hexateuch only in Gen. 26:8 J, and Josh. 2:15,18,21, where the critics are uncertain whether it belongs to J or E.

A like severance is made of clauses from their connection in respect to the increase of the waters, 7:17*b*, the perishing of all terrestrial life, 7:22,23, the diminution of the waters, 8:3*a*, and the drying of the ground, 8:13*b*. The plea in each case is that there are parallel statements conveying substantially the same thought, which cannot be referred to a single writer, who would not express himself so pleonastically. They must accordingly be regarded as indicating distinct documents. But

1. If R felt it important to emphasize the momentous character of the successive stages of the flood by these repeated statements, why may not the original writer have dwelt upon them in like manner for a similar reason?

2. After the partition is made, there still remain repetitions in each document severally, so that if this is a valid ground for division, the partition should be carried further still. The increase of the waters is stated four times with some variations in form and in the accompanying circumstances, 7:17-20; the death of all that lived upon the earth, three times, vs. 21-23; the subsidence of the waters, four times, 8:1,3,5; the drying of the surface of the ground, three times, vs. 13,14. The writer in each case recurs to the same thing again and again to note its advance, or to give expression to his sense of its extraordinary character.

3. Like repetitions abound in other cases in which no one imagines that they are traceable to a diversity of documents; thus to draw illustrations only from the narrative of the flood, see 6:11,12; 7:14-16*; 5:32, 6:10, 10:1; 9:9,11; 9:12-17.

The paragraph relating to Noah's sending out the birds, 8:6-12, is quite devoid of any critical marks allying it to one or other of the documents, as is apparent from the history of its treatment. From Astruc and Eichhorn to the supplementary critics Tuch and Knobel, it was almost uniformly assigned to P. Stähelin is uncertain about it. Reuss regards it as the sole surviving remnant of a third account of the flood distinct from the other two. Hupfeld gives 8:7, the raven, to J and vs. 8-12, the dove, to P. Friedreich Delitzsch, on the other hand, gives the raven to P and the dove to J. Kayser, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Dillmann, and others, assign the whole to J, in which they were preceded by the eccentric Ilgen. The motive which at present inclines the majority to J appears to be twofold. Such a graphic incident is thought to befit the more "picturesque" narrator, and this is the most striking parallel with the cuneiform tablets, with which J is held to stand in the closer relation. Both an argument and an inference are supplied from these two points of view of a somewhat circular nature. It is assigned to J because he is picturesque and allied to the tablets; and being so assigned proves him to be picturesque and allied to the tablets. One cannot but feel that, *mutatis mutandis*, he might with equal ease have been called "rigid

* Dillmann lays bare the secret of the whole matter, when he says on Gen. 7:16: "It is as though the author, moved by the momentous character of the day, could not do enough to satisfy himself in the detailed portraiture of the transaction."

and stereotyped" on account of his "regular formulas" and "repetition" of like phrases, thus: "and he sent forth the raven," v. 7; "and he sent forth the dove," v. 8; "and he stayed yet other seven days and sent forth the dove," vs. 10,12; "waters were abated from off the face of the ground," vs. 8,11, cf. v. 9; "to him into the ark," v. 9 *bis*; "going and returning" in Hebrew vs. 3,7, cf. v. 5:

The direction to leave the ark and the actual going forth from it, 8:15-19, are from P. J makes no mention of either. It is assumed that he must have recorded both, but R thought P's statement sufficient and hence did not preserve that of J along with it. This seems plausible. But why then was it worth while to retain both accounts of the entry into the ark, even while modifying them into almost precise conformity with one another? Is it not plain here again that the repetition in the former instance was not the inconsiderate copying of the same statement from two distinct sources, but was with the view of emphasizing the exactness with which the flood came upon the very day of the entry into the ark? There was no such emphasis connected with the moment of leaving it, and we find no repetition.

Noah's sacrifice, 8:20-22 J, and God's covenant with him, 9:1-17 P, are not parallel accounts of the same transaction, as the critics claim, but the former is preliminary to the latter. First comes the offering of the sacrifice, Jehovah's acceptance of it and his purpose not to destroy the earth again for the sin of man. This purpose is then communicated to Noah in the form of a blessing and a covenant with an instituted sign.

The examination of the narrative of the flood thus shows that so far from everything being duplicated, nothing is duplicated from first to last except the entry into the ark, and that for a special reason not suggestive of two documents, but excluding them. Moreover, when all has been assigned to J, that can with any reason be given him, this does not yield a continuous parallel record of the entire transaction. With the exception of a single clause in 7:16, it is limited to two brief paragraphs at the beginning, 6:1-8; 7:1-5, and one at the end, 8:20-22. The documentary character of J finds no support here. If there were two writers, it would seem as though J could only have made some short supplementary additions to the larger and fuller narrative of P.

But here the documentary critics retort that the supplementary hypothesis will not account for the twofold statement of the entry into the ark. They have a Redactor ready at hand who might have copied the same thing into his narrative from two different sources, and in copying might have assimilated one to the other, senseless as such a proceeding would be; but who would ever undertake to supplement a treatise that he was editing, by adding of his own motion what was already there, and that in almost identical terms, and in doing so adopt the words and phrases of the book itself instead of those which he was accustomed to employ

in every other addition made by him? Each class of critics seems to be in the right as against the other; and themselves being judges, neither form of the hypothesis is free from difficulties in this portion of Genesis.

2. No Discrepancies.

Ch. 6:1-4 is said (p. 60) to be in conflict with all that follows in two respects, (1) in limiting human life thenceforth to 120 years, (2) in ignoring the flood; the Nephilim are here spoken of, and as the Nephilim were still in existence Num. 13:33, there could in the view of the author of this passage have been no deluge in which all mankind perished with the exception of a single family. It is accordingly claimed that these verses are not properly a part of J, but have been introduced into it from J¹, an older document which knows nothing of a deluge. They are quite foreign to the context in which they are found, and contain a mythical account of the origin of the Nephilim, a gigantic race among the Canaanites, who are here represented as having sprung from the intermarriage of angels with the daughters of men. Nothing could well be more baseless and chimerical.

1. It is observable that the argument of diversity is not here rested in any measure upon differences of diction and style. Budde (*Biblische Urgeschichte*, p. 6) points out in detail the exact conformity of 6:1,2 to the language of J elsewhere.

2. The author or compiler of Genesis certainly could not intentionally have so stultified himself, as this view of the passage supposes, by inserting that as introductory to the narrative of the flood which by its very terms precludes its existence. Could he so grossly have mistaken its meaning? or is it not possible that modern critics may put a wrong interpretation on these isolated verses?

3. This most extraordinary conclusion is built on very slender premises. Its sole support is the application of the same term, "Nephilim," to antediluvians and to Canaanites. The word is obscure in its meaning and its derivation. The LXX. and Jerome translate it "giants." It is more probably an appellative than a gentile noun. It does not occur again in the narrative of the conquest, but only in the report of the spies, whose excited imagination could best express their impression of these men of great stature and powerful frames by saying that they were the old giants revived; but with no more thought of denying the fact of the deluge than one who might call an intense old fogey an antediluvian. Or if Nephilim was an actual national name, is sameness of name a sure argument of identity? May we not call the American aborigines Indians without involving ourselves in the old error of Columbus? or speak of Trojans in the State of New York without discrediting the fall of ancient Troy? or have the exploits of Jack the giant-killer anything to do with the giants of the ancient Greek mythology?

4. Whatever interpretation be put upon doubtful expressions in Gen. 6:3, it plainly intimates the divine purpose to inflict some penalty affecting the life of the whole human race. "His days shall be 120 years," if spoken of the generation then living would mean that they should not survive that limit; if of successive generations of men, that this should henceforth be the term of human life. The former is demanded by the context. The latter is preferred by critics whose uniform usage is to interpret at variance with the context, if possible. It is here absolutely without support. There is no suggestion anywhere that the duration of human life was ever fixed at 120 years. It is contradicted by all that is narrated of the ages of the patriarchs.*

The alleged discrepancy in regard to the duration of the deluge, p. 46, as though J made it 60 or 100 days and P a year, is a pure figment.

1. All the seeming basis for this misrepresentation has been destroyed by the demonstration already given that there are not two distinct accounts of the deluge.

2. But even allowing the arbitrary and indefensible partition made by the critics, their inference does not follow. The trick is so transparent that it should impose upon no one. It is simply parading a part as though it were the whole. "At the end of forty days Noah opened the window of the ark," 8:6. Forty days from what? The critics are in doubt, p. 47, note, whether to reckon from the day that the forty days' rain began or that it ended. What then is to be thought of the intelligence of R in compiling this narrative? As this verse stands, it is not possible to reckon otherwise than from the 1st day of the 10th month, 8:5. Adding to this the three periods of seven days, it appears that the dove was sent out for the last time on the 1st day of the 12th month. After another month Noah removes the covering of the ark. And in a month and twenty-seven days more he leaves the ark entirely. All is thus in perfect harmony.

3. The inference of the critics is besides quite unfounded upon their own principles. By their own concession J is not complete. His genealogy from Adam to Noah is only preserved in part. His account of building the ark and of Noah's leaving it have been omitted, R not judging it necessary to repeat from J what he had already inserted from P. Whence then this sudden confidence that no numbers originally in J have been omitted, notwithstanding the fact that such an assumption gives to his statements a meaning that they cannot now have, sets them in opposition to otherwise uncontradicted statements of P, and convicts R of incapacity or worse?

* The question whether the sons of God in 6:2,4 were angels (p. 49) has nothing to do with the critical partition of the passage and cannot here be discussed. No one need be surprised at any conceit of a certain class of interpreters. It is not strange that Josephus should have imported into this passage ideas borrowed from the Greek mythology. But it is to my mind utterly incomprehensible how judicious, not to say reverent, interpreters, could for one moment countenance an opinion so utterly without warrant or analogy in any part of Scripture, so unmeaning and so baseless.

The general direction, 6:19 P, to take a pair of each kind of animals, is made more specific when the time arrives to enter the ark, clean beasts by sevens, the unclean by twos, 7:2 J. But J also relapses into the general form of statement, 7:9; or if the critics prefer, R does so, which amounts to the same thing, as by the hypothesis he had J's previous statement before him. There is no more discrepancy here than between 7:6 and 11.

Ch. 7:10 the flood came seven days not after Noah entered the ark, but after the announcement, 7:1-4; so there is no conflict with 7:13.

The differences alleged, p. 48, "as to the form of the ark" and "the general conception of the flood" are foisted upon the text, not found in it.

We find on p. 61 a precious piece of historical and literary criticism in relation to 9:20-27. An ancient prophecy, in which the names of Shem, Japheth and Canaan appear, is there recorded, together with the circumstances under which it was delivered. The critics think the circumstances improbable; therefore they are untrue. Noah is here "a husbandman, a rôle quite distinct from that of a navigator," which he sustains elsewhere; as if he should have been cultivating the soil during the flood, or should continue to sail about in the ark after the flood was over. They can see no reason why sentence should have been pronounced upon Canaan for the shameful deed of his father; therefore there was no reason; therefore it was not done. As though it were not the keenest of inflictions upon a father to be punished in his child; and as though the law of heredity, the propagation of character and the perpetuation of the evil consequences of transgression generation after generation were not among the most patent and familiar facts, of which the beastliness of the Canaanites and their merited doom afford a signal illustration. And now, if they may change the text of the narrative on the pretext of conforming it with the prophecy, and so make Shem, Japheth and Canaan the three sons of Noah, they can thus bring it into conflict with every other statement in the history; therefore this has been extracted from a document J¹ at variance with both J and P. Or if they may reverse the process, and insert Ham instead of Canaan in the prophecy, they can show that it was not fulfilled. Or if they may put a belittling interpretation upon the prophecy, they can restrict it to a "narrow" range. By this time they have shown that something is absurd. They think that it is this venerable prophecy, whose profound and far-reaching meaning, whose appropriateness in a book intended for Israel about to enter on the conquest of Canaan, and whose exact fulfillment have been universally recognized. Most persons will think that the absurdity is in their treatment of the passage.

3. The Critical Partition.

1) THE LANGUAGE OF P.

Words already considered need not be repeated here.

6:9, (2) תמים of character, only once beside, viz., 17:1 P (often in ritual law of animal "without blemish"); in E, Josh. 24:14; cognate word תם in J, Gen. 25:27. (3) בדרתיו, cf. ברור, Gen. 7:1 J, nowhere else in Hex. with prep. ב; plur. in P to denote perpetuity of covenant with Noah, Gen. 9:12; circumcision, 17:12, and institutions in ritual law. (4) Walk with God ("free and confidential" intercourse, such as, p. 30, is ascribed to J in contrast with P), only beside 5:22, 24 P; elsewhere "walk before God," 17:1 P; 24:40 J; 48:15 E.

6:11, 12, (2) בשר כל only in flood and legislation. (3) שחת used by P, 6:13, in allusion to v. 12, also repeatedly in J: מחה in J, but also in P, Num. 5:23.

6:14, 15, (1) גפר and (2) כפר only here; (3) קומה in Hex. only here and in description of articles in tabernacle.

6:16 (1) צהר only in this sense; חלון, 8:6, assigned to J without reason.

6:17, ואני הנני, but twice besides in Hex., 9:9; Ex. 14:17; אני also repeatedly in J; אנכי, 7:4 J, but also 23:4 P. (2) מי מכול, Gen. 7:7 J; 9:11 P. (6) גוע in flood, death of patriarchs, and a few other cases; mostly with מות to make the statement more full and emphatic. Num. 20:3b is assigned to P on the ground of גוע alone, though vs. 3a, 4, 5 are from E. No record of a death in all the Hex. is assigned to J, except Gen. 11:28; 38:12; Ex. 2:23. מות is used alike by P, J and E.

6:18, (1) הקים ברית, also in J, Lev. 26:9 (so Dillmann), only of God's covenant with Noah, 9:9, 11, 17, and the patriarchs, 17:7, 19, 21; Ex. 6:4, with special reference to their perpetuity. כרת ברית, the ordinary phrase for contracting a covenant, suggestive of accompanying sacrificial rites, in all other covenants whether between men, Gen. 21:27, 32, or of God with men, Ex. 24:8; 34:27; once only of God's covenant with Abram, Gen. 15:18, with allusion to the formalities, vs. 9:10. In Deut., כרת constantly of God's covenant then made with Israel, 4:23; 5:2, 3, etc.; הקים of that with their fathers, 8:18; 29:11-13. In Ezek. 16:60, 62

הקים of God's ancient and irrevocable covenant with Israel, cf. 2 Kgs. 23:3, 24. נתן ברית of a covenant divinely granted, Gen. 9:12; 17:2; Num. 25:12. (2) the expression "thou and thy sons," etc. So in 7:7 J, or by an evasion referred to R.

6:22, (2) עשה כן emphatic formula, also Ex. 7:6, besides only in ritual law; once Ex. 12:28 in J connection though referred arbitrarily to P. (3) צוה אתו twice besides in P, 7:16; 21:4; in J, Ex. 34:4; צווה twice in J, Gen. 7:5; Ex. 4:28; in P, Num. 20:9.

7:6, (1) the calculation, so in J connection, arbitrarily referred to P, 8:13; 25:20, 26; 47:28, so also in E, Gen. 50:26; Josh. 24:29.

7:11, ארבות, 8:2, nowhere else in Hex.

7:13-16a, (1) עצם self-same Deut. 32:48 P, once in JE connection, Josh. 10:27, arbitrarily referred to Rd; in Hex. besides only in ritual contexts. (2) חיה wild beast, so J 2:20; also including domestic animals, P 1:30; 9:2, 5; J 2:19.

7:18-21, (1) גבר here four times in P; in J, 49:26; E, Ex. 17:11; nowhere else in Hex.; all five of its derivatives in J or E. (2) מאד מאד, also in J, 30:43. (3) Is fifteen cubits P more of a "calculation" than seven days and forty days, J 7:4? see also J Gen. 38:24; Num. 14:33; 32:13. (7) ב prep., used distributively, so J, Ex. 10:15 (Wellhausen).

8:1, 2a, 3b-5. (3) שכך, Num. 17:20 P, nowhere else in Hex. (7) Calculations. Hupfeld's conjecture, *Quellen d. Gen.*, p. 16, note, that 8:4 belongs to J and only the date to P is instructive as to critical methods.

8:13a, 14-19, (12) למשפחתיהם, with this form of suf. here only; למשפחתם arbitrarily referred to P, though the preceding genealogy is given to J, 10:20, 31; למשפחתיו (suf. collective) in J, Num. 11:10.

9:1-3, (1) ויברך also in J, Gen. 30:30; 32:30; 39:5, etc. (4) מורא in Hex. only here and four times in Deut. (5) חת nowhere else in Hex. התה, Gen. 35:5, insertion by R from E. (8) עשב ירק, 1:30 P; ירק besides in Hex. only Ex. 10:15 (E, Dill.; J, Well.), Num. 22:4 J.

9:4-7, (1) legal phraseology, "require blood," in Hex. besides only Gen. 42:22 E; the prohibition of eating blood is in the writer's mind based upon sacrificial expiation, Lev. 17:10-14, and proves that in his view sacrifice already

existed, contrary to the repeated allegation, p. 38 (2), p. 50 (3), etc.

9:8-11, (4) You and your seed, also in J, 26:3; 28:13.

2) THE LANGUAGE OF J.

6:1-4. If this is from J₁, it cannot be cited to show the diction of J. (3) בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים nowhere else in Hex. (3) טוֹב in a physical sense, so in P, 1:4,12; Lev. 27:10 sqq.; Num. 36:6. (4) רִיחַ only here. (5) נִפְלִים besides only Num. 13:33 E; not in J at all. (6) גְּבוּר only once in J, 10:8.

6:5-8, (3) רַק and (9) מֵצָא חֵן happen not to occur in P. (7) אֵל-לְבוּ in Hex. besides only 8:21. Alleged insertions by R are simply confessions that the facts do not correspond with the hypothesis.

7:1-5, (4) מִקְדָּשׁ, a technical word of ritual law, only in the narrative of the flood, 7:2,3, 8:20 (the verb once in E, 35:2), before the Mosaic period; there is no proof that it would have been esteemed an anachronism by P. (5) אִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ (of animals) only 7:2 bis, but in vs. 3,9 וְנִקְבָּה זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה arbitrarily assigned to R. J has זָכָר, Ex. 13:12,15, cf. also 34:23, of which נִקְבָּה is the only correlative term. P not only uses אִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ of persons, Ex. 35:29, but אִשָּׁה even of inanimate objects, as curtains, Ex. 26:3,5,6. (6) לִמְיָם Dill. adduces למָחָר Ex. 8:19 J as a parallel use of ל.

8:2b,3a, (2) שׁוֹב arbitrarily referred to J; in P, Lev. 14:39, etc.

8:6-12,13b, (2) קָלָל nowhere else in this sense; in P, Lev. 24:11 sqq.; חָסַר in P, Gen. 8:5; Ex. 16:18; in J, Gen. 18:28, nowhere else in Hex. except three times in Deut. (4) מְנוּחָה and חוֹל not elsewhere in Hex. (5) מִכְסָּה in P, Ex. 26:14, etc., the covering does not exclude a door in the side.

8:20-22, (1) מִזְבֵּחַ and (3) עֹלָה are always associated with יְהוָה, not with אֱלֹהִים, unless defined as Gen. 22:1 sqq., הָאֱלֹהִים, and 46:1, "the God of his father Isaac." רִיחַ נִיחַח, a technical expression of the ritual law (P), is here used by J. (12) כָּל-חַי only here in J (3:20 is referred to R); but also in P, 6:19, differing only in the generic article. (13) קִרְיָן, קִרְיָן only here in Hex. (14) חָם in Hex. besides only 18:1.

9:18-21, (2) נִפְצָה כָּל הָאָרֶץ, for which P is said to have נִפְרְדוּ הַגּוֹיִם בָּאָרֶץ, but Dillmann admits that they have not precisely the same sense. (6) שָׂכַר here in J₁, in Hex. besides only 43:34; cognate noun in P, Lev. 10:9; Num. 6:3.

9:22-27, (1) בְּחוּץ here in J₁, only once in J, 24:31; P has the same noun without a prep. חוּץ Lev. 18:9, or with a different prep., מִחוּץ, Gen. 6:14, etc. (2) שְׂמֹלֶה not in P. (3) אַחֲרֵיכֵן here in J₁; nowhere else in Hex.

V. SECTION 4.—GEN. 10:1-12:5.

1. No Discrepancies.

That Havilah and Sheba occur both (10:7) among the descendants of Ham and (vs. 28,29) of Shem is readily explained either as suggested, p. 55 (3), there may have been two tribes of each name, or the tribes may have been of mixed origin, partly of one race, partly of another; cf. Dedan, 10:7, 25:3; Lud, 10:13,22; Uz, 10:23, 22:21, 36:28; Asshur, 10:22, was descended from Shem; Asshurim, 25:3, from Abraham by Keturah. It is quite incredible that in the intention of the author, this obscure Arabian tribe is to be identified with the famous Assyrian empire.

"The difficulty in passing from ch. 10 to ch. 11," p. 56 (6), is purely fanciful. Before parting finally with the three sons of Noah the writer traces their descend-

ants in the different nations of mankind with their various languages, ch. 10. He then resumes the thread of his history in ch. 11, and explains how the first impulse was given to the dispersion of men and the division of languages. It is precisely as any historian would do who is not a mere annalist.

There is not the slightest ground in the text for the representation (p. 56) that "vast multitudes" were engaged in building the tower and that Jehovah was "alarmed" in consequence, or that there were only "twenty families." "Cush begat Nimrod," 10:8; but this need not indicate a single generation any more than when Noah's grandson Canaan begat several tribes, vs. 15-18, or when (Mt. 1:1) Jesus Christ is called the son of David and David the son of Abraham. How this narrative conflicts with the account of the deluge, it is impossible to see.

2. The Critical Partition.

The suspicion was early expressed that the episode respecting Nimrod (vs. 8-12) did not belong originally to ch. 10, for no reason apparently but its parenthetical character. Critics were generally agreed that the rest of the chapter was a unit; and as there was no apparent ground for attaching it to one document rather than the other, it was by some referred to P, and by others to J. Wellhausen compromised the matter by assuming that בְּנֵי the sons of, vs. 2-4, etc., was a sign of P, and יָלַד, vs. 8, 13, 15, etc., of J, and divided the chapter on that basis, in spite of the fact that these are both combined in 25:3, 4, which is confessedly from a single source.

1) THE LANGUAGE OF P.

Words before explained will not be repeated.

וַיֵּלֶד 10:1, as J 4:18; יָלַד 4:26, 10:21 J, as P 35:26, 36:5 (so Dill.), 46:22, 27; בְּנוֹיָהֶם only in this chapter. פָּרַד 10:5, but J 13:14; 25:23; 30:40; פָּלַג alleged to be its equivalent in J 10:25, found only here in Hex. אֵיִם only here in Hex. אֲשֶׁר־אֵין "not found in J" simply because it is cut out of a J context, 11:28; 15:7, and assigned to R. רָכֹשׁ clause cut out of E

context, 31:18, and assigned to P on account of this word, in 14:11, 12, 16, 21 in E (Dill.); מִקְנֵה said to be its equivalent in JE is found in P, 34:5, 23; 36:6, 7; 46:6. The words and phrases of the genealogy, 11:10-26, show it to be the continuation of that in ch. 5, but contain nothing to connect it with P more than J.

2) THE LANGUAGE OF J.

נִבְרָא but three times in Gen., 10:8 J, v. 9 R, 6:4 J, besides in Hex. only D and Rd. הוּא besides only 4:4, 26; 27:31 in all the Hex. מוֹשֶׁב in J only here, in precisely the same sense 36:43 P. שָׁפָה only here in Hex. in this sense; in P Ex. 6:12, 30. דְּבָרִים in P 34:18. לִשְׁוֹן only ch. 10 in this sense in Hex.; in J Ex. 4:10; 11:7. מִקְרָם in P Num. 34:11. בָּקָעָה here in J, nowhere in J. שָׁנַעַר once in J, twice in J. אִישׁ אֶל-רֵעֵהוּ but once in J 43:33, and without אֶל 15:10; 31:49. It does not chance to occur

in P, though רָעָהוּ does, Josh. 20:5. "P uses אִישׁ אֶל-אֲחִיו or אִישׁ אִישׁ"; but אִישׁ אִישׁ is restricted to legal sections and cannot therefore be expected in J, אִישׁ אֲחִיו in J Gen. 26:31; Ex. 16:15; Lev. 26:37 and perhaps Num. 14:4. יָהֵב here in J; in J only 38:16; 47:15, 16; Deut. 32:3. לִבְנָה, לָבֵן (verb), חָמַר and מִגְדָּל nowhere in J according to Dillmann; לִבְנָה and חָמַר in a verse of P, Ex. 1:14, but arbitrarily cut out and attributed to R. יָרַר does not happen to be used of God in P, but is implied in the

cloud and glory resting upon Sinai, Ex. 24:16, 17, and the tabernacle, 40:34 sqq., as well as in God's *going up* from Abraham, 17:22. "P makes God *appear*," so does J, Gen. 12:7; 17:1; 18:1, etc. **בְּנֵי הָאָדָם** here in J, only once in J, Deut. 32:8. **זָמַם** nowhere in J. **מִוֹלֶדֶת** in 11:28 be- longs to P (so Dill., Well.) and has precisely the same sense as in 12:1. **אֲבִי** in P 36:9 (Dill.), **שָׁם** P 36:39, see also vs. 10, 40. **עָקְרָה** in P 11:30 (Dill. and Well.). **וְלֹד** only here. **גִּדְלָה** in P, Num. 6:5.

We have now examined in detail every word and phrase alleged as characteristic of P or J, and are certainly justified in saying that the argument of diversity from this source has been immensely exaggerated. The great body of what is adduced is utterly irrelevant. The words occur so rarely as to be no criterion of a writer's ordinary diction, or they occur in the other document as well, or, if not, it is because there was no occasion for their employment. And when synonyms occur, they are used discriminatively, as determined by the shade of meaning intended and not by the accidental habit of different writers. Such facts are of no significance whatever as respects the question of the existence of distinct documents. And if the long lists of words which we have scrutinized be purged of whatever is thus most satisfactorily explained, the residuum will be very small indeed, and scarcely worth considering but for an associated fact into which we now proceed to inquire, viz.,

The Alternation of Divine Names.

This is the starting-point from which the modern hypothesis of separable documents took its rise; and its concurrence with other criteria, which taken by themselves would be of small account, lends it whatever plausibility it possesses. The occurrence of Elohim and Jehovah in alternate sections in the first few chapters of Genesis is certainly very remarkable and plainly not accidental. There are some indications, though less distinct, of a like alternation in later chapters. But after Ex. ch. 3 or ch. 6 the name Jehovah comes into established predominance, and sections in which Elohim recurs with any marked frequency (such as Ex. 13:17-19; 18:1-7, 12-27) are thenceforth extremely rare. It is quite natural, accordingly, to inquire whether these chapters, which are to some extent a turning-point in the use of these names, may not supply a key to what is peculiar in their antecedent employment.

The critics interpret Ex. 6:3 to mean that the name Jehovah was then first revealed to Moses, p. 31 (5), and had not been in use in the time of the patriarchs. They hence regard all prior sections containing the name Jehovah as in conflict with this statement, p. 36 (7. b), especially as Jehovah is used not only in the language of the writer himself but when he is reporting the words of those who lived long before Moses' time. Such sections, it is said, imply a different belief as to the origin and use of this sacred name, and must, therefore, be attributed to another writer, who held that it was known from the earliest periods and who has recorded his idea upon that subject, Gen. 4:26, p. 37 (9.c). But

1. It is plain that the Redactor did not so understand Ex. 6:3. After recording the history of the patriarchs, in which free use is made of the name Jehovah, he is here supposed to introduce the statement from the mouth of God himself that they had never heard this name, and thus to have stultified himself completely.

2. It is equally plain that it could not have been so intended. This passage finds its explanation in the repeated statement that Israel (Ex. 6:7; 10:2; 16:12; 29:46), the Egyptians (7:5; 14:4,18) and Pharaoh (7:17; 8:6,18; 9:14,29; cf. 5:2) should know that he was Jehovah; not that they should be told that this was his name, but that they should witness the manifestation of those attributes which the name denoted. That he was not so known by the patriarchs can only mean, therefore, that while tokens of his almighty power had been vouchsafed to them, no such disclosure had been made of the perfections indicated by his name Jehovah as was now to be granted to their descendants.

3. The uniform usage of Scripture proves the same thing. A true apprehension of the divine perfections and not a mere acquaintance with the word Jehovah is the constant meaning of the phrase "to know the name of Jehovah," 1 Kgs. 8:43; Ps. 9:11; 91:14; Isa. 52:6; 64:1; Jer. 16:21; Ezek. 39:6,7.

It is important to observe here precisely what these arguments prove, viz. that Ex. 6:3 was not written with an antiquarian interest or from an antiquarian point of view. It does not concern itself about the history of the word Jehovah and cannot with any fairness be regarded as affirming or denying anything about it. Its sole design is to declare that Jehovah was about to manifest himself in the character represented by this name as he had not done to the patriarchs. Since, then, the writer did not intend to assert that the word was unknown to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, there is no reason why in relating their history he might not consistently introduce this word in language uttered by them or addressed to them.

Neither, it should also be observed, was the patriarchal history written in the spirit of a verbal antiquary, so as to make a point of rigorously abstaining from employing any word not then in current use. The God of the patriarchs was the very same as Jehovah, and the writer might as properly use the dialect of his own time in speaking of him, as in reporting the language of the antediluvians, without thereby warranting the inference that he supposed Hebrew to have been at that period a current form of speech.

Whether the name Jehovah was ante-Mosaic is a legitimate subject of inquiry. But it is not answered categorically in the negative by Ex. 6:3, nor inferentially in the affirmative by the use of this word in the patriarchal history. That question lay out of the plane of the writer's thoughts in the one place as well as in the other, and no express utterance is made regarding it. Much less have contradictory answers been given to it. The inconsistency which the critics

affirm, does not exist. There is consequently no difficulty from this source in supposing that the author of Ex. 6:3 may likewise have penned the Jehovist sections in Genesis.

If we may take a suggestion from Ex. 6:3, it would be that different names of God have each their distinct and proper signification. And this inherent signification of the terms must be taken into the account, if any successful attempt is to be made to explain their usage. It is not here pretended that this principle will solve the entire problem of the employment of the divine names in Genesis. Limiting considerations and additional elements, which need not here be anticipated, will be found to enter into it hereafter. It is sufficient now to show from the passage at present under consideration, that the mechanical and superficial solution of two blended documents offered by the critics, does not really cover the case.

Gen. 4:26 is understood by the critics to affirm that in the belief of J the name Jehovah first came into use in the days of Enosh, the son of Seth, p. 37 (9. c). This accords very well with Eve's use of Elohim, 4:25, at the birth of Seth and in conversation with the serpent, 3:1-5, but not with her mention of Jehovah, 4:1, at the birth of Cain. Reuss says that the writer here contradicts himself. Dillmann can only evade the difficulty by a transposition of the text. All which simply proves that their interpretation of 4:26 is false. It fixes the origin not of the word Jehovah, but of the formal invocation of God, the institution of public worship.

The exceptional introduction of Elohim in chs. 2:4-4:26, a section mainly characterized by Jehovah, shows that these names are used discriminatingly within the same document. Elohim is substituted for Jehovah in the conversation with the serpent, 3:1-5, as elsewhere in language used by aliens or addressed to them, Gen. chs. 20, 21:22, 23. At first sight it seems strange that Cain should be accepted, 4:1, as a gift from Jehovah, and Seth, 4:25, from Elohim; but in the latter passage the contrast is between man and God, see Gesen. Lex., אֱלֹהִים, B. 1. Cain slew Abel, but God bestowed another in his stead.

A like discrimination in the use of the divine names is obvious as between this section as a whole and the preceding Elohim section, 1:1-2:3; God working in nature and in the world at large is Elohim. True, the creative act may be ascribed to Jehovah, Ex. 20:11, when the thought to be conveyed is that Israel's God, who brought him out of the land of Egypt, was the creator of the world; but when the announcement to be made simply is that the world had a divine creator, Elohim is the proper term and is hence used in ch. 1 and to the end of the first section. Jehovah is distinctively the God of revelation and of redemption; hence in the succeeding section, where God's grace to man is the prominent thought, his care and favor bestowed upon him in his original estate, the primal promise of mercy after the fall, and the goodness mingled with severity which

marked the whole ordering of his condition subsequently, Jehovah is the only proper term. While to make it plain that Jehovah is not a different or inferior deity, but that the God of grace is one with God the Creator, both names are combined, Jehovah Elohim, throughout chs. 2 and 3. Is this appropriate use of these terms merely a lucky accident and wholly undesigned, resulting from the combination of two independent documents, in each of which the names of God are regulated, not by their suitableness to the subject matter, but by the mere habit of the writer?

In ch. 5 the Elohim of v. 1 is adopted from 1:27, and the Jehovah of v. 29 from 3:17; cf. v. 14. The only other divine name in the chapter is Elohim in vs. 22, 24. The phrase "walked with God" is used twice of Enoch and once of Noah, 6:9. As "man of God" is an established expression, while "man of Jehovah" never occurs, so we find "walk before Jehovah," Gen. 24:40, and "walk after Jehovah," Deut. 13:5, but never "walk with Jehovah;" only "walk with God," Mic. 6:8 (note the interchange of divine names in this verse). It is suggestive of the contrast between God and men, holy intercourse with God, not communion with the ungodly world, and so "God took him."

In chs. 6-9 there is an equal appropriateness in the use of the divine names. At the beginning and at the end both names occur in J paragraphs in an instructive manner. It is Jehovah who extends his grace to Noah while resolving to destroy the wicked world; at the same time usage calls for "sons of Elohim" rather than "sons of Jehovah," 6:1-8. Again in 9:26, 27 Jehovah is the God of Shem, the father of the chosen race, but it is Elohim, the God of universal providence and of all mankind, who shall enlarge Japheth.

Throughout the narrative of the flood it is mostly Elohim that is used, because it is God the Creator destroying the works of his own hands, and the God of providence directing the preservation of the various species of living things in the ark and covenanting that all terrestrial creatures shall not be again destroyed by a deluge. It is only when the thought is more especially directed to the saving of Noah's pious house and of clean animals intended for sacrifice, that Jehovah is employed. Thus Jehovah bids them enter the ark, 7:1-5, and shuts them in, v. 16, and accepts Noah's sacrifice, 8:20-22.

In chs. 10-12:5 it is Jehovah, the God of the chosen race, who calls Abram and gives him promises, 12:1 sqq. It is also Jehovah who, in the interest of his plan of grace and of his kingdom on earth, defeats the machinations of the builders of Babel, 11:1-9, and keeps his eye upon Nimrod, the founder of an empire which was the first embodiment of worldly power, 10:9.

This survey of the use of the divine names in the chapters under consideration supplies more than a negative argument. It not only shows that the alternation is readily explicable without the assumption of diverse documents, but it reveals a propriety in their employment which cannot be accidental, and never

could have resulted from piecing together documents independently conceived and written, in each of which one particular name was used irrespective of the subject treated. Whether a like propriety in the use of these names rules in the rest of Genesis or not, is for the present a matter of no concern. The method observable in their employment in the chapters before us, is a fact for which the document hypothesis cannot account.

The Divine Names and Language.

But though neither the language of these chapters nor the divine names regarded separately lend any support to the document hypothesis, possibly the case may be altered when they are taken together. It is claimed, p. 67, 2 (2), "that whenever Elohim is used, it is accompanied by a certain series of words, and that it is just so in the use of Yahweh." But really this is not so.

In the first Elohim section (1:1-2:3), of the words and phrases adduced as characteristic, some recur nowhere else in the Hexateuch, others nowhere else in Genesis, and others still in but one other narrative in Genesis, that of the flood, a theme closely related to that of the creation, and here they are found in both its P and J paragraphs. Beyond this there is scarcely a characteristic word or phrase which reappears in another P section of Genesis. The second so-called Elohim section, ch. 5, has, as it has been shown, no right to be so considered. Beyond a few expressions directly borrowed in equal measure from P and J sections, neither ch. 5 nor the kindred genealogy, 11:10-26, contain anything to ally them to any of the P sections.

The next Elohim section, that of the flood, is almost equally detached in point of language from all the succeeding P sections of Genesis. Of the words and phrases here adduced as characteristic a few recur in Gen. ch. 17;* but beyond this scarcely one is to be found again in P in the rest of Genesis† (creation excepted), not as many, in fact, as reappear in J. In the so-called Elohist portion of chs. 10, 11 and 12:1-5 (though Elohim does not occur in it) there is not one word found elsewhere in P that is not also in J, except רכוש and the cognate verb רכש. The former of these occurs several times in ch. 14, which is universally held not to belong to P; and it is only excluded from E in another passage by critical jugglery.

* The following are common to the flood and Gen. 17, viz., תמים 17:1; ברתיו nowhere else (הקים בריית 17:4; ואני הנני 17:7,9,12; לדרתיכם and לדרתם 17:7,19,21; עצם self-same, 17:23,26; מאד מאד 17:2,6,20 (J 30:43); ב distributive, 17:23; "with you and with your seed after you," 17:8,19, repeated with explicit allusion to this passage, 28:4; 35:12.

† But two are found in P elsewhere in Gen., viz., שחת of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, 19:21 P, repeatedly in J, גוע of the death of patriarchs, 25:8,17; 35:29; 49:33. צור 21:4 has no significance, besides in Hex. only in J, Ex. 34:4. חיה wild beast only J and E, 37:20,33. גבר only J 49:26. ירק besides in Hex. only in J and E; "thou and thy sons and thy wife," etc., 6:18; cf. in J 19:12,16.

With such a state of facts it is the merest delusion for the critics to say that Elohim, wherever it occurs, is always accompanied by the same series of words. They have simply imposed upon themselves by lists of words which are in large part unmeaning, but from which superficial conclusions are drawn with no scrutiny of their real significance and value.

Add to this that in order to maintain their hypothesis the critics find it necessary to assume the existence of two Elohist documents, one of which is so closely related to J in style and conception and so intimately blended with it that it is always extremely difficult and sometimes quite impossible to separate them. This certainly has the appearance of an evasion, which is equivalent to an indirect confession of the futility of the entire hypothesis. We are first told that the text of Genesis must be divided with reference to the names Elohim and Jehovah; and the style and diction of P and J are inferred from the paragraphs respectively assigned to them. We proceed further in the analysis, and lo! Elohim perversely occurs where the criteria of P made out from the early chapters will no longer apply. The critics tell us that this must be a second Elohist. It will be incumbent, however, upon them to make it very plain that the second Elohist is not simply an exigency of their own hypothesis; otherwise it can only be accepted as a reluctant admission that the criteria previously laid down for P are false.

The Divine Names and Theology.

It is further claimed that if "we divide these chapters into two divisions simply on the basis of the use of the divine names," we shall discover "that each division has its own peculiar and widely different conception of God, etc.," p. 67. 2 (5). If Elohim and Jehovah are words of different signification, and represent the Most High under different aspects of his being, as they manifestly do, they must when used correctly and with regard to their proper meaning, be associated with different conceptions of God. This will not argue a diversity of writers, but simply that the divine name has each time been selected in accordance with the idea to be expressed.

Elohim is the more general and so to speak abstract designation of God as the creator and providential governor of the world at large and of the whole collective mass of mankind. Jehovah is his personal name and that by which he has made himself known when entering into close relations with men, and particularly the chosen race, as the God of revelation and the God of grace. Hence result these three consequences:

1. This intimacy of relationship involves a condescension to man and placing himself in accord with man, which requires anthropomorphisms for its expression and can be made intelligible in no other way.

2. It is to God as Jehovah that man pays his worship; so that when altars and sacrifice and invocation are spoken of, Jehovah is the term proper to be used.

3. It is Jehovah who has established his kingdom amongst men, and who is directing the course of that kingdom so as to further his gracious designs. It is naturally to be expected, therefore, that the unfolding of these plans and opening prophetic glimpses into his designs will be attributed to Jehovah rather than Elohim.

If now the various propositions in which the theology of P and of J are set forth with not a little iteration, be relieved of their exaggerations and inaccuracies and corrected into accordance with the text from which they are professedly drawn, it will be found that they cover just what, as has now been shown, the difference of the divine names calls for; just that and nothing more.

Why God's speaking in the first person plural is "strictly monotheistic" in P 1:26, p. 29 (1), but "not so rigidly" so in J 3:22; 11:7, p. 30 (1), others may be able to explain; I cannot. It is not commonly supposed that God is any the less "an infinite being" for working with means of his own creation, p. 30 (2), than when he works without them. J speaks (2:4) of "Jehovah God's making earth and heaven" with no suggestion of any material. Forming the body of man (2:7) of dust, into which for his sin it was to be again resolved (3:19), and Eve from the rib of Adam (2:22 sqq.) in token of the oneness of their being, demanded as real an exercise of divine power as bidding the earth to bring forth grass and living creatures, 1:12,24. Why Jehovah "causing a strong east wind to blow in order to bring locusts (Ex. 10:13,19), or to drive back the sea (Ex. 14:21)" J, p. 30 (2), is a result brought about "by natural means," when God's making "a wind to pass over the earth and the waters assuaged," 8:1, P, is not "a natural event," but "the fiat of almighty power," p. 50 (5), I do not see. For an illustration of the difficulty which the critics create for themselves on this point, together with a professed answer in which the difficulty is simply ignored, see p. 58 (2).

If no one has "attempted to reconcile ch. 2" with "modern science," p. 30 (2), it cannot be because there was any difficulty in doing it. The chronological arrangement of ch. 1 presents a basis of comparison with geological discoveries which is wanting in the topical arrangement of ch. 2. But man's spiritual kinship with God, and the composition of his body from materials furnished by the inorganic matter of the earth (2:7), his absolute superiority of nature to the brute creation, 2:20, and the inviolability of the marriage relation, 2:24, are the lessons of the chapter; and science may dispute them if it can.

If in J "man is on free and even confidential terms with God," p. 30 (3), this belongs appropriately to Jehovah, as the condescending God of grace who permits and invites men to "come boldly" unto him, Heb. 4:16. But how is it in P, 5:22; 6:9, where Enoch and Noah "walked with God," and 17:18,22, when Abraham talked with God until "God went up from" him, just as in J Jehovah came down from heaven, 11:5; 18:21, and visited men, 18:1 sqq., though all the while in heaven, 19:24? And how is it that "walking with God" is a

"phrase which in J would be meaningless," p. 38 (4), when "walking before Jehovah" is the phrase by which Abraham's pious life is described, 24:40? The irony with which, 3:22, the words of the tempter, 3:5, are repeated as fulfilled in a disastrous sense, does not imply that man had gained a "superhuman attribute" by eating the forbidden fruit, p. 30 (4). Cain's fear is not that "Jehovah cannot protect him," 4:14, but that he will not. The angel disabled Jacob's thigh by a touch, 32:25, not "because he was likely to prevail," but to show him how impotent he really was. The suggestion respecting 3:8 and 2:21, p. 31 (5), is too trivial for a serious reply. If "in 11:5; 18:20-22 God is represented as resorting to personal inspection to ascertain something of which he is ignorant," the same is the case in Ps. 14:2 and even in Ps. 139:23,24, where it is attached to the most exalted description in human language of the omnipresence and the omniscience of the infinite God. There is not the slightest inconsistency between the anthropomorphisms of J and the lofty conceptions of P. They abound alike in the Psalms and are freely intermingled in their devout utterances. With one breath the Psalmist speaks of God as knowing the secrets of the heart, 44:22, and with the next calls upon him "Awake, why sleepest thou?" v. 24.

It should be observed further that P has his anthropomorphisms likewise, and that even in ch. 1 with all its grandeur and simplicity. Each creative fiat is uttered in human language, 1:3,6 sqq. God "called the light אור," 1:5, giving Hebrew names to that and various other objects. He "saw the light that it was good" 1:4, thus inspecting the work of each day and pronouncing upon its quality. He uttered a formula of blessing upon the various orders of living things, 1:22,28. He deliberated with himself prior to the creation of man, 1:26. Man was made "in the image of God," an expression which has been wrested to imply a material form. Time was spent upon the work; and this was parceled into six successive days like so many working periods of men. When the work was done, God rested on the seventh day, 2:2; and thus the week was completed, again a human measure of time. All this is anthropomorphic. He who would speak intelligently to finite comprehension of the infinite God, must use anthropomorphisms. The difference after all is not of kind but of degree.

The statement is repeatedly made that according to P sacrifices had no existence before the time of Moses, p. 38 (2 and 4), 50 (3), 51 (3). This is altogether unwarranted. No affirmation of the sort is made in any section attributed to P; nor is any declaration made that is inconsistent with the prior existence of sacrifices. The whole truth in the case is that Jehovah, being the personal name of God and the name under which he is worshiped, this name is preferably employed when sacrifice is mentioned or alluded to; so that the absence of reference to sacrifice in Elohim sections is sufficiently accounted for. And yet Elohim directs Abraham to offer Isaac as a burnt-offering, 22:2 sqq., and Jacob offers sacrifices to Elohim, 46:1. If the critics refer these to a second Elohist, because

P never mentions sacrifice; and then argue that P never mentions sacrifice, since these passages belong to E and not to P, is not that a circular style of reasoning?

Besides, the existence of sacrifice is implied, as before suggested, in the prohibition of eating blood, 9:4. And it is well worthy of consideration whether it is not also implied in the rite of circumcision, 17:10 sqq. If this be, as Ewald supposes, in its original idea, "a blood-offering," it shows a familiarity with the conception of expiation by the shedding of blood, out of which it sprung. Or if it be explained with Schultz,* as "a consecration of the life to God by a painful and bloody purification," it at least involves the idea of the clean and unclean and purgation by blood.

Argument would be easier and more satisfactory, if random remarks were avoided, and nothing imputed to the writers of Scripture which is not in their words either explicitly or by fair implication. In addition to corrections previously made, p. 38 (3) has no foundation in the original record: "J seems to think that Cain should have had more knowledge than he exhibits. He should have known that Yahweh prefers a bloody offering." This neither agrees with (2) immediately above, nor with the reason given for the rejection of Cain's offering, 4:7. "He favors those who dwell in tents and have cattle, and looks with suspicion on the man of the field"; how does this agree with Adam being referred for his subsistence to "the herb of the field," 3:18, and "the father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle," 4:20, being traced to the apostate line of Cain? And where does J express any opinion about "the Rechabite"? or object to "sowing or reaping," cf. 26:12; 27:27,28? or to "agriculture," which is contemplated in every promise of the land of Canaan and implied in the legislation attributed to J, Ex. 34:18 sqq.? or show any disposition to "cling to the old pastoral life," whereas the sentence pronounced upon the people for their sin, Num. 14:33 J (Heb.), is "Your children shall be shepherds in the wilderness forty years"?

Diversity of Style.

The stately account of the creation, ch. 1, is compared with the narrative that follows chs. 2,3, pp. 25-27; or the genealogy from Adam to Noah, ch. 5, with the story of Cain and Abel, ch. 4, pp. 33,34, and the conclusion is drawn that P is chronological, statistical, stereotyped and repetitious, while J is free and flowing, vivid and picturesque. With the same propriety a bill presented by a merchant to his customer might be compared with a letter written to his wife and diversity of authorship inferred, because one deals in dates and figures and business forms and the other in easy flowing sentences. If two narratives of like character be compared with fairness and candor, the alleged diversities will disappear. It is curious to observe how different critics vary in their judgment respecting style, showing that a subjective element enters largely into their opinions. Thus Eich-

**Alttestamentliche Theologie*, p. 401.

horn* holds a very different view of these writers from that suggested above. In his opinion P in ch. 1 exhibits high art and a carefully arranged and admirably executed plan; every word is so nicely weighed that the same formulæ can be used successively in the various scenes which he portrays. J in chs. 2,3, is a less skillful and practiced writer.

The only section in which there is a reasonable opportunity for a comparison of style is that of the flood. And a moment's examination will show that the judgment passed upon it (p. 45) is purely subjective, not elicited from the passage itself, but obtruded upon it. The style of P is said to be

"(1) Characterized by a systematic arrangement of material, as is seen in (a) the introduction, 'These are the generations,' etc. [it has been shown that this belongs not to the P sections in particular, but to the plan of the book in its completed form]; (b) the five months of increase of flood; (c) the five months of decrease [but compare the forty days, 7:4,12, and forty days, 8:6; the seven days, 7:4,10, and seven days, 8:10,12]; (d) the gradual leading up to the Noachic covenant (9:1-17) [but compare the preparation (7:2,3,8) for the sacrifice, 8:20] the law of bloodshed which is given in such detail as to show that it is a point of greatest importance in the writer's mind [but compare what is said, p. 39 (4), of J's presentation of the guilt of the murderer]; (e) the return to the formula of ch. 5 in 9:28,29 [as already shown the history of the flood is simply inserted in the body of the genealogy; having completed the former, he again takes up the latter where he left it]."

"(2) Is minute, chronological, scientific, as seen in (a) the calculation of the age of Noah, 7:6,11 [v. 6 is enclosed in a J paragraph and only cut out and assigned to P because of this calculation; v. 11 adjoins a J paragraph and might just as easily have been attached to it, if the critics had chosen], 9:28,29 [already explained]; (b)-(h) [7:1 implies a previous mention of the ark. If J is an independent and continuous document, it must have given an account of the ark which has been omitted. Where is the evidence that this was less detailed and minute?]; (i) the rigid classification in 6:18; 7:13 [exactly the same in 7:7, the reference of which to R is mere evasion]; (j) the classes of animals in 6:20, etc. [so 6:7; 7:8, 23; in v. 23 the enumeration is transferred to P, though it carries with it **וימחו** claimed as a criterion of J, p. 46 (3)]; (k) the use of **למינו**, **זכר ונקבה**, etc. [previously explained: "male and female" in J 7:3,9]; (l) the trouble taken to declare the absolute universality of the flood [the evidence adduced in the note is 7:19-23, and the words attributed to J in these verses are as sweeping and universal as the rest. "The high mountains under the whole heaven," v. 19, by any reasonable principle of interpretation mean neither the Andes nor the Himalayas, but all within the scope of Noah's vision and perhaps

* *Repertorium für Bibl. und Morgenlind. Literatur*, part A, pp. 137,174.

the writer's knowledge. The flood was universal enough to accomplish its purpose, 6:7. The way in which it was brought about is explained 7:11,12. The ocean rushed in upon the land in consequence no doubt of the subsidence of the latter, and torrents poured down from the skies. At length the flow of the ocean ceased and its waters retreated (8:2) from the emergence of the land. All is in harmony with geologic laws and admitted facts]; (m) the legal phraseology of 9:4-6 [previously explained]."

And all the rest that is adduced on this subject is of the same nature.

CONCLUSION.

The matter contained in the sections respectively attributed to J and to P in the chapters now under consideration, is on p. 65 summed up under nine heads practically identical in both and treated in the same order. Such a remarkable correspondence throughout makes it impossible to conceive that these represent two entirely independent documents. The discrepancies and contradictions alleged to prove diversity of authorship do not exist; and if they did, they would make the work of the Redactor inconceivable. There is not a duplicate account of the creation, nor of the line of descent from Adam to the existing race of mankind, nor of the deluge. There are no such differences of language between the sections of J and P, as require the assumption of a diversity of writers. The alternation of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah can be explained without that assumption. The alleged difference of style is factitious. The difference in theological conceptions is linked with the signification and usage of Elohim and Jehovah, the selection of the name having been made (so far as we have yet gone) in accordance with the thought to be conveyed, and so far from the same series of words being invariably attendant upon Elohim and Jehovah respectively, the characteristic P expressions in the account of the creation and the deluge are conspicuously absent from every other P section in Genesis, except ch. 17, the covenant of circumcision with Abraham.

If the current critical hypothesis has any ground to rest upon in Gen. 1:1-12:5, we have not been able to find it. The "grave doubts" of Prof. Reuss, the venerable father of this hypothesis in its present form (*Geschichte d. A. T.*, p. 255), whether any of the sections attributed to the work of the Jehovist prior to Gen. 12, really belonged to it, have been confirmed by our examination. Whether any thing after Gen. 12 belonged to it, must be a matter for future inquiry.

The present article has not been written in the interest of any particular hypothesis of the origin of Genesis. No hypothesis on that subject has been propounded or defended. We have simply inquired into the strength of the arguments adduced in favor of the solution offered by the critics, and have found them wanting. We are conscious of no antecedent bias against a critical analysis of the Book of Genesis, and its partition among different writers, if

that can be fairly established. No prejudice need thence arise against Moses being the author or at least the editor of the book. The remark p. 70 (6) is certainly over-hasty: "If there is an analysis, even these chapters furnish enough to show that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch; for, *if Gen. 1-12 was written long after Moses' death*, it is presumable that the other portions of the Hexateuch which follow and connect with these chapters belong also to a later date." Not a word has yet been said tending to establish the hypothetical clause italicized above. No argument urged in favor of the analysis of Genesis would affect the question of its Mosaic composition, but such as are inconsistent with the honesty or capacity of the Redactor, and those are suicidal to the hypothesis itself.

If now, without positively committing ourselves at this stage of the discussion, the facts thus far developed may be allowed to shape themselves in the direction of some definite issue, may it not be said that the present indications seem to favor something like the old Vitranga hypothesis? Moses was in possession of some ancient genealogical registers, preserved among his people from their ancestors. And the alternation of יֵלֶד and הוֹלִיד may possibly, as Kurtz* long ago suspected, be traceable to the varying forms of expression in these old registers. Besides this the story of the creation and the flood and the covenant with Abraham, ch. 17, seem to be bound together by their diction in a very peculiar manner. These great outstanding facts, whether reduced to writing or gaining a fixed form by oral repetition, filled the soul of the ardent young Hebrew, as they were read to him or told to him in his boyhood by his mother or the men of his nation. And these old stories shine through his narrative, just as his Egyptian training shines out in his laws, without its being possible in either case to exactly reproduce by a critical process from what he has written, just what he had heard or had been taught.

The peculiar use of the divine names in Genesis points likewise to the same conclusion. It finds its only adequate explanation not in the mechanical assumption of the blending of two documents representing different ideas of the origin of the name Jehovah, but of one writer standing at the point of transition from the old to the new, himself the leader in that great crisis in which this sacred name assumed a prominence and gained a fullness of meaning unknown before, and to whom its significance had been unfolded by the Lord himself. Genesis

* *Die Einheit der Genesis* (Berlin, 1846), p. 32. I cannot too strongly recommend this masterly treatise to those who are studying the critical partition of the Pentateuch. The supplementary hypothesis was then in vogue and its arguments are specially directed against it; but they are equally valid against any other form of critical division. The distinguished author was unfortunately induced subsequently to accept a compromise, proposed with the best intentions, which yielded the direct Mosaic authorship, but insisted on the substantially Mosaic character of the contents of the Pentateuch. The subsequent course of Pentateuch criticism in Germany has shown that this was a mistake. If evangelical critics in that country had stood upon the line of defense so ably drawn out by Kurtz, and made their advances from it, they would occupy a far stronger position and maintain a more hopeful attitude than they do at present.

reflects a time prior to that in which this name had practically superseded every other appellation of the Most High, and was habitually used of the true God in every aspect of his being. It is employed with nice discrimination, and by one who, while he delights to trace Israel's covenant God in even the first buddings of his scheme of grace and through all its successive stages, is at the same time near enough to the patriarchal age to have had some of the divine transactions, by which it was characterized, traditionally conveyed to him in the exact form in which they originally took place.

One word, in closing, as to "Hasisadra," p. 62. There are striking points of correspondence between the deluge tablets and the Bible narrative which have their interest and importance. But only he can consistently maintain that the latter is borrowed from the former, who fancies that genuine coin is an attempted imitation of the spurious, and that pure drugs were originated as rivals of the adulterated article. My own private opinion on the subject corresponds with that of Zophar, the Naamathite, respecting the Darwinian hypothesis. When he would say in the most emphatic manner that a thing is impossible, he says that it may take place "when a wild ass's colt is born a man," Job 11:12.*

ERRATA.

On p. 138, the first half of the seventh line from the bottom ought to read, "but on the conjectures of the critics." So in copy.

On p. 157, in the second line of the second column of small type, it will be readily seen that ורכו should be ורכו.

* The second article by Professor Harper will be published in the July number of *HEBRAICA*.

NOTES ON THE HEBREW VERB—PLURAL IN Â.

BY REV. JOHN P. PETERS, PH. D.,

Professor in P. E. Divinity School of Philadelphia, and in the University of Pennsylvania.

In "miscellaneous notes"* I called attention to what seemed to me instances of the use of 3d fem. plur. in â in the perfect of the Hebrew verb, as in other Semitic languages. To the few cases there enumerated I am now able, largely through the kindness of Mr. W. R. Newbold, to add the following: Deut. xxxii. 27; Josh. xvii. 18; 1 Sam. iv. 15; Isa. lxvi. 18 (if the text be not corrupt); Jer. xlviii. 15, 41 (twice); li. 29; Ps. xviii. 35 (in the parallel passage, 2 Sam. xxii. 35, a 3d sing. masc. verb is used with a fem. plur. noun); lxviii. 14. To these ten should be added the following, which have been changed by the Massoretes into plurals in â: Num. xxxiv. 4; Deut. xxi. 7; Josh. xv. 4; xviii. 12, 14, 19; 1 Kgs. xxii. 49; Jer. ii. 15; xxii. 16; iv. 6; twenty cases in all.

These are ordinarily explained by the grammarians as incorrect or careless usage, or as mere scribal errors, an explanation entirely inadequate in view both of their number, and also of the fact that every other Semitic language (including the Hebrew itself in the imperfect) possesses the feminine plural in â.

There are further two cases, 2 Kgs. xxiv. 10 and Job xvi. 16, where the plural in â is used with masculine nouns. I would also suggest as a possible emendation in Job xxvi. 13, שְׁפָרָה for שְׁפָרָה, which would bring this passage under the same head.

In my note on the formation of the imperfect in the same issue I neglected to notice three cases of the formation of the 3d fem. plur. with the prefix ' , as in other Semitic languages, viz., Gen. xxx. 38; 1 Sam. vi. 12; Dan. viii. 22.

The origin and force of the suffixes and prefixes of perfect and imperfect seem to me to be as follows: In the perfect the simple form of the verb remained unchanged in the most usual person, i. e., the 3d person, the 1st and 2d persons being differentiated by pronominal suffixes. The simple verb form was finally limited to the most usual forms of the third person, i. e., the 3d sing. masc., and the other gender and number were differentiated by suffixes of the same nature as those used in noun declension. Accordingly the feminine was indicated by t, the masc. plur. by û (cf. in noun declension ê and î), and the fem. plur. by â (cf. in noun declension â and t, modified to ôt). As in the case of nouns the fem. sing. in *at* ultimately gave place to â, and in consequence the fem. plur. went out of use to a great extent, the masc. plur. taking its place.

* *HEBRAICA*, III., p. 111.

The imperfect is indicated by prefixes. The weakest possible consonantal prefix, ' (or, in Aramaean, ʾ), represents, if I may so express it, this principle of prefixing, having in itself no value of person or number. As above explained, the form with ' was ultimately appropriated for the 3d person, the other persons being indicated by pronominal prefixes. As in the perfect, the feminine was indicated by t, which, following the characteristic imperfect principle, was placed at the beginning, not the end, of the word. The plural was formed as in the perfect by adding û and â (the latter becoming nâ by insertion of euphonic ʾ). No plural ending was added in the first person, because the prefix in itself constituted a sufficient differentiation. Similarly the 3d fem. plur. was originally formed without the feminine prefix, the ending constituting a sufficient differentiation from the 3d plur. masc. Later, in Hebrew, the feminine t was prefixed to this form also, and the older plural form, יִקְטְלֶנָּה, was lost from general use.

PRONOMINAL ROOTS.

BY PROF. A. J. MAAS, S. J.,

Woodstock, Md.

Pronouns are nouns expressing the more common general relations in language (cf. Fürst, *Aram. Idioms*, § 190.; and Olshausen, *Lehrbuch*, n. 94). They may be reduced to four classes,—demonstrative, relative, indefinite and interrogative pronouns. Grammars usually treat of these as of correlative words. I shall first, therefore, say a word on the connection of correlatives; secondly, give a table of their roots; thirdly, apply the given roots to the four classes of pronouns, beginning with the most emphatic demonstratives, the personal pronouns.

I. CONNECTION OF CORRELATIVES.

Correlatives embrace demonstrative, relative, indefinite and interrogative pronouns and particles. These four classes are easily reduced to two,—the one containing the demonstrative and relative pronouns; the other, the indefinite and interrogative. Apollonius (*Animadv. ad vet. gramm. doct. de artic.*, p. 20 ed. Lips.) points out a twofold demonstration,—*δείξιν τῆς ὁψευδους* and *δείξιν τοῦ νοῦ*, i. e. an ocular and a mental one. The particle employed in the former is now called demonstrative, while the word that points forward to what we are going to say, or back to what we have said, is called relative. Originally the same word served as demonstrative and relative, as is still evident in the Latin particle “*ce*” which appears in both “*hi-c*” and “*qui—*” (cf. Schœmanni, *Quæst. Gramm.*, c. 1., Gryphiswald, 1865, p. 5 sq.).

The second class of correlatives embraces the indefinite and interrogative particles. These two were identical in the beginning, and are so still in many cases. Compare, for instance, the Greek *τις*, *πότερος*, *ποσος*, *ποιος*, *πῆλικος*, *πov*, *ποθεν*, *ποι*, *ποτε*, *πως*, *πη*, the Latin *quis*, etc. Only the accent and the inflection of voice indicate whether these particles are employed as indefinite or as interrogative. Language is perfectly logical in identifying the interrogative and indefinite particles. For a question supposes a state of indefinite and imperfect knowledge in the inquirer. Nobody can ask about what he is absolutely ignorant. “*Ignoti nulla cupido*,” as the old Scholastics used to say. On the other hand, the human mind is inquisitive by nature, or, as Seneca said, “*Natura curiosum nobis ingenium dedit*,” and consequently we are naturally inclined to inquire about what we but imperfectly know. Inquiry and indefinite knowledge being naturally connected,

we must be prepared to see this connection expressed in the particles employed to manifest that state of mind. And if we consider that all language is demonstrative, we rightly name the indefinite particles indefinite demonstratives.

All particles, then, were originally either definite or indefinite demonstratives. Apollonius may again serve as our guide. He distinguishes *τὴν πλησίον* and *τὴν πόρρω δέξιν*, and would no doubt have identified his divisions with our definite and indefinite demonstration. It is difficult, however, to determine the exact limit between the *πλησίον* and the *πόρρω δέξιν*, and language had to grapple with this difficulty in the concrete. Like Alexander, it cut the Gordian knot without untying it. The same particle was used for both definite and indefinite demonstration, accent and inflection of voice serving again as distinguishing characteristics. A parallel instance may be seen in the use of the German definite article, where emphasis and context decide whether *der* is article, or relative, or demonstrative. Cf. Schoemann in the passage cited above.

II. TABLE OF SEMITIC PRONOMINAL ROOTS.

	COMPARE				
	Sanscrit	Latin	Greek	Gothic	German and English
1. אֲנִי-אָנֹכִי-אַתָּה	i-dam, ah	is—e-go	ἐ-γώ	ik	ich—I
2. הוּא-הֵי-הֵיאָה	yas,yau,ye	hi-c	ὁ, ὅς	jus	ihr—who, he
3. זֶה-זֶה-זֶה	sá, sas	sui, ip-se	δεῖνα(?), σὺ	sik, sis	sich—
4. כֹּחַ-כֵּי-כֹחַ	kas,kau,ke	-ce, qui	ἐ-κεῖνος	ik	kein, ich
5. מִי-מִי-מִי	mat	me, ego-met	ἡ-μεῖς, ἐ-μεῖ	mik	mich—me
6. נִי-נִי-נִי	nas	nos, ne	νῶ	uns	uns
7. פִּי-פִּי-פִּי	api	ip-se	σφός		
8. תוּ-תוּ-תוּ	twat, tat	tu, is-te	τὸ, τὸν, τῆς	thu	der, dieser—this, that

The Sanscrit, Latin, Greek, Gothic, English and German pronominal forms I merely suggest as comparisons, without asserting their absolute identity with the respective Semitic particles. The manner in which they combine, however, will be indirectly suggested in treating of the composition of the Semitic pronouns.

III. ANALYSIS OF SEMITIC PRONOUNS.

I begin with an analysis of the personal pronoun, because it is the most emphatic and definite demonstrative. The following table contains the component elements of only the Hebrew personal pronoun; but the peculiarities of the personal pronouns in the various Semitic dialects will be given below.

Singular	Plural
אֲנִי = אֲנִי + הָא + כִּי	אֲנֵנוּ = אֲנֵנוּ + הָא + נוּ
אַתָּה = הָא + תָּא + אַנ or תָּה + אַנ	אַתֶּם = מָא + תוּ + אַתֶּם
אַתְּ = אַתְּ + תִּי	אַתֶּן = נָא + תוּ + אַתֶּן
הוּא = הָא + הוּ + הוּא	הֵם = מָא + הוּ + הֵם
הֵיא = הָא + הִי + אַה	הֵן = נָא + הוּ + הֵן

According to this table all pronominal forms are preceded by the particle **אֲנִי**. That this was originally the case even in the pronoun of the third person singular and plural is plain from the corresponding Aramaic forms, **אַנְהוּ**, **אַנְהִי**, **אַנְנִי**, **אַנְיָ**, etc. The rejection of initial **אֲנִי** has its analogy in Syriac, when the personal pronoun serves as copula or accompanies the act. participle. Thus **أَنْتَ أَنْتَ** reads "omarno;" **أَنْتَ أَنْتَ** reads "iliditun" (cf. Merx, *Gramm. Syriaca*, p. 108 seq.). The third person may thus have lost its initial **אֲנִי** even in writing, on account of its frequent occurrence in phrases where **אֲנִי** was omitted in pronunciation.

אֲנִי may be compared to the Latin "en", the Hebrew **הֵן**, and the Arabic **أَنَّ**. It is a particle that draws the attention of the hearer to what is going to follow. The Syriac **أَنْتَ**, Arabic **أَنَّ**, Mand. **אנא**, Chald. **אנא**, Samarit. **אנא** and Ethiopic **አን** are nothing but **הָא + אֲנִי**, i. e. *en eum* (cf. the Lat. *eccum*). The Hebrew **אֲנִי** and Assyrian **an-nâ ku** consist of the elements **אֲנִי-הָא-כִּי**, i. e. *en hi-c*. **הָא** changes not unfrequently into quiescent **ו** or **י**. Thus we have **בֹּשֶׁת** besides Chald. **בִּהַת**, **דֹּר** besides Arabic **دَرْ**, **מֹהַל** and **נֹהַר** (cf. Gesenius, *Lexic.*, under **הָא**). The Hebrew **אֲנִי** may be explained as **אֲנִי-אִי** or **אֲנִי-הִי**,

The second person singular masculine explains itself in almost all Semitic dialects. Its component elements are distinctly traceable in Arab. **أَنْتَ**, Chald. **אַתָּה** or **אַתְּ**, Mand. **אנאת**, and Syr. **أَنْتَ**; the Ethiopic form too tells its own story **አንተ**. In Heb. **אַתָּה** and Assyrian **atta** the **אֲנִי** of **אֲנִי** has suffered assimilation. The *linea occultans* of the Syriac **أَنْتَ** indicates the same assimilation at least in pronunciation. The second person feminine singular differs from the masculine only by its termination, the final vowel vanishing entirely or attenuating to hîreq. But the characteristics of gender terminations will be treated later on.

The third person has rejected its initial **אֲנִי** in all dialects except the Chaldee.

The Assyrian šû and šî must be derived from הו and ה' . הוּא and הִיא have their equivalents in هُوَ and هِيَ, while in Syriac ܘܐ and ܘܝ the final element has disappeared. The Mandaric 何 and 何, Samaritan 𐤅𐤍 𐤅 and 𐤅𐤍 𐤅 and Ethiopic ቀኋ ቸ and ይኋ ቸ offer no special difficulty.

In the plural forms the radical terminations 𐤍 and 𐤌 are characteristic, the former in the masculine gender and the latter in the feminine. If we look upon the plural as an indefinite state of the noun, the plural terminations may be regarded as indefinite particles. We may compare the use of *tenween* in Arabic (cf. Lansing, *Arab. Man.*, Special Preface, p. x). This hint must suffice here. The plural terminations will be spoken of again when we come to the indefinite demonstratives.

אֲנִי then consists of אֶנ-הֵא-נו, the middle element being transformed into ה. Changes of ה into 𐤆 occur frequently enough to justify our conjecture. Thus we have הוה and חוה, גח and גה, גבה and גבה (cf. Gesenius, *Lexicon*, under ה). In גחני the initial א is rejected. אני is either a shortened form of אֲנִי, the medial elements having been rejected, or a derived form of אֶנ-הו, Arabic نَحْنُ, Syriac ܢܝܢܝ and ܢܝܢܝܝܝܢ, Chaldee אֲנַחְנָא and נַחְנָא, Ethiopic ን፡ and Samarit. 𐤍 𐤍 𐤅 and 𐤍 𐤍 𐤅. In Assyrian (a)nini and Mand. אנני medial ה has been changed to quiescent ʾ, a well-known process, while in Chald. אנן the guttural element is elided.

[To be continued.]

➤CONTRIBUTED NOTES.◀

Devise Evil.—This is a familiar phrase in Scripture. See Prov. III. 29; XIV. 22; Ezek. XI. 2; Mic. II. 1,3. It is no less common in Assyrian. See V. R. 1. 128; Sm. Asshurbanipal, 25. 15,16; Prof. Lyon's Manual, 46. 20. Where Asshurbanipal says of Tarquu (Tirhakah) and other rebellious rulers in Egypt, *ištini'û amat limuttim*, they devised an evil plot, literally an evil word, so V. R. 2. 5, Manual 48. 6, and Sm. Assurbanipal, 27. 31. Another verb (*qapadu*) with the same meaning is used in V. R. 1. 120, Manual 46. 11, and Sm. Asshurbanipal, 24. 2. See also V. R. 4. 43, Manual 25. 32, and Sm. Asshurbanipal 162. 100. Again in V. R. 4. 68, Manual 26. 20, Sm. Asshurbanipal 165.4. Many more places might be quoted, but these are enough to show the identity of the phrase in both languages.

THOS. LAURIE, D. D.,
Providence, R. I.

House of their Fathers.—This phrase is of frequent occurrence in the Hebrew. See Num. I. 2,4,18,20,22,24,44,45; Esth. IV. 14; 1 Sam. XXII. 16; XXIV. 21; 2 Sam. III. 29; Ezra V. 29. The Jewish tribes (Shibatim) were divided first into families (*mishpakhoth*) and these again into Fathers' Houses (*Beith Ha Aboth*).

Precisely the same phrase occurs in the Assyrian. In I. R. 60, also in Prof. Lyon's Manual, 11. 11, Sennacherib says that *Tsidqa*, king of Isqualuna (Ascalon), who did not submit to my yoke, the God of the house of his fathers, *ilani bit abišu*, himself, his wife, his sons, his daughters, his brother, the seed of the house of his father *zir bit abišu* I carried off by force and led to Assyria.

The same expression also occurs frequently in the records of Asshurbanipal. See V. R. 4. 23, found also in Sm. Asshurbanipal, 160. 83, and Prof. Lyon's Manual, 25. 17. Again V. R. 4. 40, and Manual 25. 29, Sm. Asshurbanipal, 162. 97, also 176. 56, and 177. 83. Further citations are unnecessary.

T. L.

Mouth.—There is one meaning of the Hebrew word פֶּה, according to Gesenius, that does not appear in our English Bibles, either old version or new revision. In Gen. XXIV. 57, Laban according to our translation proposes to inquire at the mouth of Rebekah, Gesenius dispenses with the awkward preposition *at* and makes him propose to ask *counsel* of Rebekah. So Josh. IX. 14 and Isa. XXX. 2 is precisely the same rendering of our Bible and correction of it by Gesenius. The Assyrian fully sanctions the distinguished Hebrew scholar in his emendation, though he did not live to know it.

In V. R. 8. 48, found also in Prof. Lyon's Assyrian Manual, 29. 17, Asshur-banipal says that Abiyati, king of Arabia, *piiṣu iškimma*, literally "set his mouth" with the Nabateans. Obviously he took counsel with them, and so came to an agreement with them, so that their mouths spoke the same words and their hearts had the same purposes. Thus the old Assyrian records endorse the rendering arrived at independently by modern Hebrew Lexicography. T. L.

The Inscription of Tabnit.—In this beautiful Phœnician Inscription, discovered in 1887 by Hamdi Bey at Saida,* there are only one or two phrases which still puzzle the student. Line 3 contains such a puzzle in the word **מִי**. Derenbourg has already seen that we expect something equivalent to the phrase **קִנְמִי** **את כל אדם** in line 4 of the *Eṣmūnazār* inscription. He suggests a derivative from the root **ימא** "jurer." It is a wonder he did not hit upon the right solution. We must read **קִנְמִי את כל אדם**. The sense becomes clear at once. This correction cannot be objected to, seeing that we have a similar mistake in the last line of the same inscription, where Renan's reading **אל** [**אלן**] seems quite certain. We might also be inclined to suspect **אל אל**, did it not occur twice, and have a parallel in **איכל** in the Marseilles Sacrificial Tablet.† [With **תִּפֶּק**, cf. Isa. LVIII. 10 **וְתִפֶּק לָרֶעֶב נֶפֶשׁ**]. Compare a very similar mistake in the *Eṣmūnazār* inscription, line 6, where Barth conjectures **אל השמע** [**אל השמע**] "do not listen to their words."‡

RICHARD GOTTHEIL,
Columbia College, N. Y.

Prof. Bickell's System of Hebrew Metre.—Gregory Barhebraeus [Ethic. Par. 1 c. 5, § 4] as quoted in Assemani *Bibl. Orient.*, [tom. 1, p. 166] has the following sentence:

وَأَمَّا زَيْدٌ فَكَفَلَتْهُ أُمُّهُ وَأَمَّا إِسْحَاقُ فَكَفَلَتْهُ أُمُّهُ
وَأَمَّا يَسَعْيَا فَكَفَلَتْهُ أُمُّهُ وَأَمَّا يَسَعْيَا فَكَفَلَتْهُ أُمُّهُ

Castelli's Syriac *Lexicon* under **فَكَفَلَتْهُ** expressly states: "Transfertur etiam **فَكَفَلَتْهُ** ad modos poeticos, versusque verbum dicitur. Sic Barhebraeus dicit, Balaeum multa carmina composuisse ad modum (poeticos) acceptos a Davide." If then Balai and Isaac wrote verses like David, it is but reasonable to apply in the scansion of David's verses and of all Hebrew poetry the canons of the Syriac poets. Prof. Bickell's system of Hebrew metre is therefore a rediscovery of Barhebraeus' system.

* Renan, *Revue Archéologique*, x., 1887, pp. 1 sqq. Derenbourg, *Revue des Etudes Juives*, xv., No. 29, 1887, p. 109 sqq. Halevy, *ibid.*, p. 292, and the literature mentioned in the *Orientalische Bibliographie*, I., Nos. 1140, 3148, 3153, 3155, 3157, 3160, 3165, 3166; II., Nos. 1237, 1239, 1240, 1241, 2633, 4463.

† C. I. S., p. 225, l. 18, 21.

‡ ZDMG, xli., 643.

Judg. XV. 16.—The Innsbrucker *Theol. Zeitung* [1888, II. pp. 246 sqq.] has a valuable suggestion concerning Judg. xv. 16. The Massoretic text reads:

בְּלֶחִי הַחֲמֹר חֲמֹר חֲמֹרִים
בְּלֶחִי הַחֲמֹר הַבִּיתִי אֶלֶף אִישׁ:

This is rendered by the Authorized Version: "With the jawbone of an ass heaps upon heaps; with the jawbone of an ass have I slain a thousand men." Tenner, in his paper above referred to, suggests the adoption of the Septuagint reading instead of the Massoretic. The first half of the verse, "ἐν σιαγόνι ὄνου ἐξαλείφω ἐξηλείψα αὐτούς," he translates: "With the jawbone of the ass have I dyed them thoroughly," giving to ἐξαλείφειν its primary meaning "to dye," "to anoint," in preference to its more usual secondary meaning, "to destroy." Next he proposes the pointing חֲמֹרִים instead of חֲמֹרִים and the rendering: "With the jawbone of the ass [the red one] have I reddened them," instead of the commonly admitted translation. Finally several reasons are stated why Tenner's reading should be adopted. 1. It explains away חֲמֹרִים, an old *crux interpretum*. 2. It accounts for the LXX. rendering. 3. It brings Samson's play on words into more prominence. 4. It explains how Samson could have overcome the army of the Philistines with the jawbone of an ass. According to the suggested reading he did not necessarily kill all—which would require at least sixteen hours' hard work, allowing a minute for a man—but he reddened *them*, an indefinite number, and thus overcame a thousand, the rest preferring flight to bleeding noses.

Postscript to Semitic Studies in America.—My short sketch on "The Present Status of Semitic Studies in America," in the last number of *HEBRAICA*, did not aim at being in any way exhaustive, its purpose being merely to give a general view of what was being done at the present moment in this country by way of promoting the study of the Semitic languages and their literatures. I felt at the time that, owing to a lack of sufficient statistical material, there were probably some omissions of facts which would further strengthen the grounds for the hopeful tone taken by the speakers at Dr. Pepper's reception. I find this to be the case.

First among these omissions, I desire to mention that excellent institution, the Theological Seminary at Newton Centre, Mass., which, according to private information that has reached me, has provided for instruction in the various Semitic languages for more than ten years. With such an able specialist as C. R. Brown in charge, it is quite natural to find the Newton Seminary attaching the very greatest importance to the thorough drilling of its students in general Semitic philology. Prof. Brown himself ought to have been referred to by me as

one of the pioneers in the movement which has brought Semitic studies into the foreground in this country, and I am truly sorry that I should by a pure accident have forgotten to mention his name in my short sketch. Secondly, among the universities providing at present for instruction in some of the Semitic languages, Haverford College and the University of the City of New York ought certainly to have been mentioned. At the former, a chair for biblical languages is occupied by the distinguished scholar, J. Rendell Harris, and during the temporary absence of Prof. Harris from the country, the instruction in the department, including, as a matter of course, Hebrew, is given by Prof. Robert W. Rogers. Dr. Abram S. Isaacs is the Professor of Hebrew at the New York University, and he intends extending the opportunities for study by adding, at an early date, other Semitic languages to the courses. And right here mention might be made of the encouraging fact that Princeton may be expected to offer full courses in Semitic languages ere long under the leadership of Prof. Frothingham, supplementing the instruction in Hebrew at the Princeton Theological Seminary by the nestor of Hebrew scholars in this country, W. H. Green. Also at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, instruction is given in Syriac, and if I mistake not courses in Assyrian are now offered. Prof. Sproull, of the University of Cincinnati, writes me that he intends organizing classes in Assyrian next year in addition to the Arabic classes he has led for the past years. Finally, the fact might be mentioned that Dr. Cyrus Adler, of the Johns Hopkins University, has delivered some lectures on Assyriology in its bearings on the Old Testament before the students of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. I shall be grateful for all information on the subject, in case that I decide to prepare at some future time an exhaustive paper.

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.,

University of Pennsylvania.

A Manuscript of the Ethiopic Psalter.—Through the kindness of Mr. Hall N. Jackson, of Philadelphia, I have had the privilege of examining one of the few Ethiopic manuscripts that have found their way to the United States. The manuscript was given to the Rev. Augustus Jackson, the father of the present owner, by his nephew, a naval officer, who found it in a jar in some place in the Holy Land.

The manuscript turns out to be a well written copy of the regular Ethiopic Psalter. The parchment leaves are 7 by 6½ inches in size, five double leaves or twenty pages being stitched together, and eighteen such parts constituting the whole book. The work is thus one of 360 pages. The contents are chiefly the Ethiopic Psalter. This means that not only the Psalms themselves are given, but also certain extracts from both the Old and New Testaments and also from the Apocrypha, which are generally found in connection with the Psalms in Ethiopic manuscripts. These go by the technical name of "Songs of the Prophets and

their Prayers." In this manuscript, as also in those from which Ludolph prepared his excellent edition of the Ethiopic Psalms, contains the Prayer of Moses (Ex. xv.); the Second Prayer of Moses (Deut. xxxii.); the Third Prayer of Moses (continuation of second, from v. 22 on); Prayer of Hannah for Samuel (1 Sam. ii.); Prayer of Hezekiah, the king of the Jews (Isa. xxxviii. 10 sqq.); Prayer of Manasseh, a piece from the Apocrypha; the Prayer of the Prophet Jonah (Jon. ii.); the Prayer of Azariah, from the Apocrypha; the Prayer of the three Children, also Apocrypha; a Blessing, from the same source; the Prayer of the Prophet Habakkuk (Hab. iii.); the Prayer of Isaiah the Prophet (Isa. xxvi.); the Prayer of Mary (Lk. i.); the Prayer of Zacharias (Lk. i.); the Prayer of Simeon (Lk. ii.); the whole of Canticles. Ludolph especially remarks (Psalter, p. 18), that these additions were found in every manuscript of the Ethiopic Psalter of which he had any knowledge.

But our manuscript contains even more. The last forty-one pages are taken up by a typically Ethiopic panegyric on the Virgin Mary. It is written in the same hand as the first part and has undergone the same revision, and accordingly could not be merely by accident bound together with the Psalter. Its object could be only edification, although it seems to be arranged also for a responsive service. It differs externally from the Psalter in being written in three columns on each page, while the latter is in only one. The manuscript itself is a good one. It was, however, not such originally. A second has gone over every word and has carefully revised the whole. Sometimes whole words and even lines have been erased and a better text inserted; at other places a missing letter has been added or a superfluous letter removed. Only now and then has an error escaped the corrector. This makes the manuscript rather a valuable one, and one that can be used to advantage should a new edition of the Ethiopic Psalms be needed. The evidences that it is an old manuscript are at hand. The endless changes and exchanges in the gutturals, which are characteristic of later manuscripts, are wanting to a marked degree; in a great majority of cases the guttural demanded by the etymology of the word is retained. The vowels, too, are carefully written, only at times does the short *a* usurp the place of the long *a*, especially in the plural, and only occasionally is the sixth or fundamental form of the consonant used for some other form.

GEORGE H. SCHODDE,
Capital University, Columbus, O.

An Arabic Coin.—Recently Mr. Charles G. Nicholson, the Baltimore banker, quite well known as a numismatist, came to me with a beautifully inscribed large gold coin, for which he had not been able to obtain any decipherment. I told Mr. Nicholson that the inscription was in early interlaced Arabic, and extremely difficult to resolve, but if he would leave the coin for study, I would promise to obtain him the solution.

Lately, I had been reading Arabic with Prof. Nahoum Moucarzel, a native Libanian, late professor at the Jesuit university in Syria (Beyrouth) and at the Jesuit college in Cairo, Egypt, to whom I proposed the problem. The gentleman answered that he could not make out the inscription, as it was in the early interlaced Arabic and very difficult to translate. I suggested to him the word "Allah," God, which he recognized, and the matter ended there for the time. A few days later I said to the gentleman, "Come, we must make out the inscription of this coin, no matter how much time or trouble it takes. We cannot let a difficulty overcome us." We set to work.

Tentative results were at first obtained, and finally the complete solution, thanks to his very perfect knowledge, not merely of modern Arabic, but of the more perfect forms of literary Arabic. The coin is larger than a silver shilling or twenty-five cent piece, round, but coming to a point at one end. The inscription on either side is included in a square of bars with dots. Outside the square runs the date and the name of the Caliph.

The plate gives the transcription into modern Arabic letters. Holding the



point in the left hand with the Arabic letters in proper position, the translation runs thus. On one side, read: "To God, who created the greatest of his dear friends on earth, Mahomet. The Caliphate." On the other: "There is no other God but God, and Mahomet is his Prophet. 981. 212. Caliphate of Abdalla." The coin would then be of the year 827 of the Christian era. The dates are given in numbers of the Hegira. The year 622 of the Christian era was the beginning of the Hegira. Counting the months at 11-12, we obtain the dates corresponding as follows:

Number of the coin, 981; date of coinage, 212 A. H., 827 A. D.; beginning of Caliphate of Abdalla, 198 A. H., 813 A. D.; end of reign of Abdalla, 218 A. H., 833 A. D.; year of the Hegira, 198 to 218, reign of Abdalla; Christian year, 813 to 833, reign of Abdallah.

The monarch spoken of on this coin is Abdalla, son of the great Haroun al Rachid of Arabian Nights' fame. Abdalla followed the footsteps of his ancestors in the love of the arts and sciences. In his youth he studied literature and jurisprudence. As he grew older he studied philosophy and astronomy.

His reign was troubled by the revolt of his brother Amine against him and also of his uncle Abraham, son of the Mahdi, to whom Abdalla shows clemency and exceeding generosity. He warred against many princes and finally died in war. His subjects followed him in the study of the sciences. He translated Euclid, gathered around him the savants of his time and encouraged all who had talent. He wished to conquer by knowledge rather than by the sword, and often said one must not follow the example of the Chinese and the Turks who know only how to do manual labor. But as man ought to be worthy of his creation in the likeness of God, and as the soul is very noble, we must elevate ourselves by the study of philosophy and science to the height of the soul, and not lower ourselves to the earth in obeying the inclinations of the body. The Turks were the mamelukes or slaves of these caliphes of the Abassides. After their revolts the Turks became the conquerors, and the Arabians are now the subjects of the Turks.

J. F. X. O'CONOR, S. J.

The Use of the Tenses in Hebrew Narrative.—In *HEBRAICA*, July and October, 1886, were published some notes of mine on the above subject, including a classified table of the occurrences of the different tenses in the Hexateuch. I should now like to put before the readers of *HEBRAICA* a similar table, embracing, with the exception of a few isolated paragraphs, all the narrative portions of the Hebrew Old Testament. My object in the former and present notes is simply to state and classify a limited group of facts, and in a very humble way to illustrate the present theory and nomenclature, not to assail them. I should have thought that this was evident from the general tenor of the notes. But Prof. Curtiss in the 1887 volume of "Current Discussions in Theology" credits me with setting "to work to defend the old terminology of 'past and future' by an analysis of the Pentateuch and Joshua." I am not sufficiently presumptuous to enter upon this formidable undertaking, and if I did I should not depend on so absurdly inadequate a method. I felt then and still feel that the modern theory is often stated in works of great authority and wide use in a way that misleads the student as to the actual usage of the tense, and I believe that it may be well to call attention to the actual facts of the case.

By way of explanation of the accompanying table I may repeat the following explanations from my former article, pointing out, however, that for the sake of compactness columns 2 and 3 have been combined and also 5 and 6.

Perfect.

1. Cases where the Hebrew Perfect may be translated as a Past Tense without any difficulty as regards context.
2. Cases where such a translation is difficult.
3. Cases where such a translation seems rendered impossible by the context.

Imperfect with Waw Consec.

4. } As in case of Perfect, substituting "Imperfect with Waw Consec." for
5. } "Perfect."
6. }

Imperfect.

7. Cases where the Hebrew Imperfect may be translated by an English Future, Present, or Subjunctive, or by *may, can*, etc.
8. Cases where the Imperfect has a frequentative sense.
9. Cases where it seems necessary to translate the Imperfect by the English Past Imperfect or other past tense.

Perfect with Waw Consec.

11. } As in case of Imperfect, substituting "Perfect with Waw Consec." for
12. } Imperfect.

It will be obvious that to be perfectly sure that no errors from inadvertence have crept in would require much time, more time than I have had at my disposal. But this is perhaps less important than it would be in some other cases, as the proportion between the numbers in columns 1, 4, 7, 10 and those in the other columns is too great to be affected by mere inadvertencies.

	Perfect.		Imperfect with Waw Consec.		Imperfect.			Perfect with Waw Consec.		
	1.	2 & 3	4.	5 & 6	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
Hexateuch.....	2827	6	4829	2	4116	51	33	2584	46	22
Judges and Ruth.....	507	3	1279	..	317	103	10	6
Samuel.....	1061	11	2386	1	753	36	36	248	44	27
Kings.....	1268	17	2242	..	562	27	18	239	12	44
Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah..	1328	2	1799	1	434	29	10	113	7	34
Esther.....	141	2	158	..	64	4	..	6	..	4
Job I., II., XLII. 7 to end.....	37	..	84	..	12	2	..	1	6	2
Isaiah, parts of XXXVI. to XXXIX.	41	..	65	..	36	..	1	12
Jeremiah XXXVI., XLIII., LII....	173	..	200	..	113	4	2	52	1	7
Jonah I., II. 2, II. 11 to end.....	25	1	79	..	20	3
Daniel I.-II. 4.....	12	..	28	..	8	1
	7420	42	13149	4	6435	153	100	3362	126	146

On the whole the proportions of the different numbers in the fuller table are so similar to those in the smaller that any comment on them would be largely a repetition of what I have already said. The increase in the proportion of the numbers in columns 8 and 9 and 11 and 12 to those in columns 7 and 10 would necessitate a modification of some of the results obtained from the Hexateuch ; but I prefer to reserve anything I might say on this and other points, till I can also deal with the non-narrative sections.

W. H. BENNETT, M. A. (Lond. and Camb.),
Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge,
Professor of Biblical Literature, Hackney College, London.

➤BOOK ♦NOTICES.◀

KRALL, TYRE AND SIDON.*

This well-written and instructive pamphlet we would most earnestly recommend to all interested in the history of the ancient Orient. The writer has most carefully compared all the notices of these two cities and of the other Phenician towns found in Egyptian texts with those of the Greek historians. He comes to the conclusion that the oldest Phenician town known to the Egyptians was *Byblos*,

known in Egyptian as Kapuna (𓆎𓆏𓆑𓆒) an exact transliteration

tion of the Semitic גבל, the Greek βύβλος, which plays a part already in the Egyptian mythology. It is also mentioned in texts dating from the reign of Thutmosis III. (reigned 1480-1430 B. C.) and in Pap. Anastasi I. a text dating from the reign of Ramses II. (reigned 1300-1230 B. C.). Another town mentioned in the Thutmosis texts and Pap. An. I. is *Aradus*, Semit. ארדר, Eg. dema en

ardtu (𓆎𓆏𓆑𓆒𓆓𓆔𓆕𓆖𓆗𓆘𓆙).† The first mention of Tyre צר

is found in Pap. An. I., where it is called *Tjar en mern* "Harbor-Tyre." *Sidon* is not mentioned in the old texts. He concludes, thus, that while Byblos and Aradus were in the oldest times the chief towns of Phenicia, Tyre gained the supremacy later on and finally surrendered the hegemony to Sidon.

His remarks on the history of Paleography in his second section are to me convincing. He conjectures that the Semitic alphabet was derived from the thirty and more signs the Egyptians used in transliterating Semitic names. And it is but natural that the Phenicians dwelling in Egypt should have attempted to write their language by means of the letters the Egyptians had already set aside for this purpose. It is along the general lines indicated by Krall, then, that all further progress in this interesting question must proceed.

Section III. treats of the peoples that invaded Egypt under Ramses III. (about 1180 B. C.), and the general result of his investigation is that they came from Asia Minor, a very probable conjecture indeed.

* KRALL: "Studien zur altaeg. Geschichte." III. "Tyrus und Sidon." Reprinted from Sitz. Ber. der phil.-hist. classe der Wiener Akademie, vol. cxvi., Bd. 1 Hft., p. 631.

† The town of Arad.

His fourth section treats of the Cheta. He justly warns us of speaking of a mighty Cheta empire. The strength of the Cheta in the times of Ramses II. lay in the fact that their kingdom stood at the head of a mighty coalition of Syrian states directed against Ramses. The danger over, the coalition dissolved, and the Cheta kingdom again returned to its old position. When the Assyrians invaded Syria the Cheta, whom they called Hatti, were a small people. It is, then, unnecessary to assume that the kingdom was destroyed by the above-mentioned invasion that seriously menaced Egypt.

In conclusion he gives a sketch of the history of Tyre and Sidon, and touches the question of etymology of the Greek names. The name of Sidon, צִדְּן, came to the Greeks directly from the Sidonians, while that of Tyre, צֶר, came to them from Egypt—where it was Tjar—hence Gr. *τύρος*.

The first and second excursi touch questions in Herodotus, while the third relates to an Eg. inscription.

F. C. H. WENDEL.

◀SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.▶

- KAYSER, C. Das Buch v. der Erkenntniss der Wahrheit oder der Ursache aller Ursachen. Nach den Syrische Handschr. zu Berlin, Rom, Paris u. Oxford hrsg. Leipzig: *Hinrichs*, 1889. M.25.
- CALAND, W. De schepping volgens Genesis en de Eraansche Overlevering. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 2, 1889.
- WILHELM, E. L'Origine des Achemenides. *Le Museon*, Jan., 1889.
- PIZZI, J. Quelques Particularites de la langue de Firdusi. *Ibid.*
- WIEDEMANN, A. Le Culte des Animaux en Egypt. *Ibid.*, April, 1889.
- LANDAUER, S. Studien zu Merx' Chrestomathia targumica. *Ztschr. f. Assyriologie*, Nov., 1888.
- TELONI, B. Appunti intorno all' Iscrizione di Nabonid. V. R. 65. *Ibid.*
- EVETTS, B. T. A. On five unpublished Cylinders of Sennacherib. *Ibid.*
- HALEVY, JOS. Notes assyriologiques. *Ibid.*
- SCHRADER, EB. Die Göttin Ištar als malkatu und Sarratu. *Ibid.*
- PEISER, F. E. Eine babylonische Verfügung von Todes wegen. *Ibid.*
- LEHMANN, C. F. Aus dem Funde von Tell-el-Amarna. *Ibid.*
- JENSEN, P. Zu IV R. 8, 51b. *Ibid.*
- BRÜNNÓW, R. E. Zur assyrischen Wortordnung. *Ibid.*
- M. Einige Bemerkungen zur Erklärung des Sintflutberichtes. *Ibid.*
- STRASSMAIER, J. N. Arsaciden Inschriften. *Ztschr. f. Assyriologie*, Aug., 1888.
- OPPERT, J. Les Documents juridiques cuneiformes. *Ibid.*
- HALEVY, J. Notes assyriologiques. *Ibid.*
- JENSEN u. ZIMMERN. Namen und Zeichen für Haustiere bei Gudea. *Ibid.*
- BUDGE, E. A. W. On some recently acquired Babylonian Tablets. *Ibid.*
- SAYCE, A. H. The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van. *Journ. Royal Asiatic Soc.* xx., 1888.
- GRAETZ. On the Signification of the Jewish Coins with the Lulab (Palm-branches) and Portal. *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1888; 3.
- NESTLE, E. Syriac Grammar with bibliography, chrestomathy and glossary. Second enlarged and improved edition of the "Brevis linguae syriace grammatica." Translated from the German by A. R. S. Kennedy. Berlin. \$3.00.
- Verhandlungen des VII. internationalen Orientalisten Congresses, gehalten in Wien in Jahre, 1886. Aegyptisch-africanische section, pp. 111. \$1.50.
- Semitische Section, mit 3 Lichtdruck-Tafeln, pp. 373 \$5.50.
- SCERBO, FR. Grammatica della lingua ebraica. Firenze, 1888.
- EDWARDS, A. B. The Nature of the Egyptian "Ka." In *The Academy*, Jan. 5, 1889.
- RENOUF, P. Le P. Two Vignettes from the Book of the Dead. *P.S.B.A.* xi. 2.
- A Coptic Translation of an Arabic Text. *Ibid.*, xi., 5.
- WIEDEMANN, DR. A. On the Legends concerning the Youth of Moses. *Ibid.*
- Some Monuments of Mont at Thebes. *Ibid.*, xi., 3.
- BEZOLD, DR. C. Some unpublished Cuneiform Syllabaries, *Ibid.*, xi., 2.

- BEZOLD, Dr. C. Two Inscriptions of Nabonidus. *P.S.B.A.* XI., 3.
 — A Cuneiform List of Gods. *Ibid.*, XI., 5.
 TOMKINS, H. G. Note on the Name Nepiriuriu in the Karnak lists of Northern Syria. *Ibid.*, XI., 3.
 BALL, Rev. C. J. Inscriptions of Nebuchadrezzar the Great. IX. The Cylinder 85. 4-30 British Museum. *Ibid.*, XI., 5.
 — Note on the word called Urkarîna. *Ibid.*, XI., 4.
 GRIFFITH, F. L. Notes on the Text of the d'Orbiney Papyrus. *Ibid.*
 DE LACOUPERIE, Dr. T. The Fabulous Fishermen of Babylonia and China. *Bab. and Orient. Rec.*, II., 10, 1888.
 — Origin from Babylonia and Elam of the early Chinese Civilization. *Ibid.*, III., 3, 4, 1889.
 TOMKINS, Rev. H. G. Notes on the Geography of Northern Syria and some Neighboring Lands viewed from the Assyrian side. *Ibid.*, III., 1, 2.
 — Notes on the Geography from the Nile to the Euphrates as known to the Ancient Egyptians. *Ibid.*, II., 4.
 BONAVIA, E. Sacred Trees of the Assyrian Monuments. *Ibid.*, III., 11, 12.
 DE HARLEZ, Dr. C. A Buddhist Repertory. *Ibid.*, III., 1, 2, 3.
 SAYCE, Prof. A. H. An Assyrian Talismanic Tablet belonging to M. Bouriant. *Ibid.*, III., 1.
 DELATTRE, A. The Oracles given in favor of Esarhaddon. *Ibid.*, III., 2.
 HAGEN, O. E. The Geographical Situation of Saparda. *Ibid.*, III., 2.
 BALL, Rev. C. J. The True Name of the God of Israel. *Ibid.*, III., 3.
 DVORAK, R. Baki als Dichter. *Z. d. D. M. G.*, IV., 1888.
 GOLDZIEHER, IGN. "Turab" u. "Hagar" in zurechtweisenden Redensart. *Ibid.*
 SCHREINER, M. Zur Geschichte der Polemik zwischen Juden und Muhammedanern. *Ibid.*
 PRAETORIUS, F. Grunert's Alliteration im Alt-Arabischen. Review. *Ibid.*
 SIMONSEN, D. Ein Nachtrag zu der Abhandlung über "Gebrauch von Psalmen zur Zauberei." *Ibid.*
 Proceedings of the American Oriental Society at Philadelphia, Pa., Oct. 31-Nov. 1, 1888. New Haven: The American Oriental Society. Tuttle, Morehouse & Taylor, printers.
 HUTH, GEO. Zur vergleichenden Litteratur-Kunde des Orients. *Mittl. des Akad-Orient. Ver.*, 2, 1889.
 GOTTHEIL, R. Zur Textkritik der Pešittâ. *Ibid.*
 BUHL, F. Jesaja oversat og fortolket. 1st Heft. Kjobenhavn: Gyldendal, 1889.
 CONDER, C. R. The Alphabet: The Semitic Names. *Palestine Expl. Fund.*, Jan., 1889.
 KUENEN, A. De Melecheth des Hemels in h. VII. en XLIV. van Jeremia. *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninkl. Akad. van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde*, III., R. Deel V., 1888.
 Le Talmud de Jérusalem. Traduit pour la première fois par Moïse Schwab. Tome XI, et dernier. Traités Sanhèdrin (fin), Makkoth, Schebouoth, Aboda, Zara, Horaïoth, Niddah. Paris: Lib. Maisonneuve et Leclerc, 1889. 10f.
 HAUPT, Dr. P. The Dimensions of the Babylonian Ark. In *American Journal of Philology*, IX., 4.